

Modern Language Notes

Volume XLII

JANUARY, 1927

Number 1

THE DOWNFALL OF THE THREE UNITIES

The rebellion in the eighteenth century against the three sacred unities of time, place, and action has been described at great length in Lounsbury's *Shakespeare as a Dramatic Artist*. All students of Shakespeare's fame and its influence upon the drama must be grateful for Professor Lounsbury's elaborate study. But it is unfortunately inaccurate in details and vague in dealing with the period of transition in the last half of the eighteenth century. And, curiously enough, it ascribes to Lessing "the credit of being the first to demonstrate the inapplicability of the unities to the modern drama except under special conditions,—conditions which the modern author is generally unwilling to observe."¹ This honor concerns literary theory rather than theatrical practice, says Lounsbury, for Lessing had almost no influence in England in the latter part of the eighteenth century. The real determining influence in the theatre was the actual popularity of Shakespeare's plays on the stage.²

This, briefly, is Lounsbury's argument, which gives to the much vilified Shakespearean criticism of the eighteenth century much less than its due, and to Lessing more. In the famous review of Voltaire's *Mérope*³ to which Lounsbury refers, Lessing merely recapitulates in two paragraphs an argument of his English predecessors that the unities of time and place were necessary in the ancient drama only because of the chorus. Then he goes on, not to attack the rules but to expose the evasion of them in Voltaire's

¹ Lounsbury, p. 75.

² Lounsbury, pp. 87-91.

³ *Hamburgische Dramaturgie*, Nos. 44-50, especially 46.

Mérope and the French drama generally. Excellent as this long essay is, it is scarcely, in the beginning⁴ of 1768, a radical attack upon the unities. And, of course, it had no immediate influence in England.

In the introduction to his volume of *Eighteenth-Century Essays on Shakespeare*⁵ Nichol Smith gives a brief account of the period of transition. Nichol Smith says justly that Dr. Johnson's Preface to his edition of Shakespeare gives the final blow to the defenders of the unities; but he does not attempt to give evidence in support of his assertion. The purposes of this article are to give the evidence, to prove that Nichol Smith errs (if he errs at all) on the conservative side, and to discuss the very interesting periodical reviews of Dr. Johnson's Preface.

It will not be necessary to discuss again the early protests of Howard⁶ (1668), Temple⁷ (1690), and Farquhar⁸ (1702). Sensible and unanswerable as they were, they were isolated and ineffective. They had, moreover, little direct reference to Shakespeare. For three-quarters of a century, the neo-classical criticism of Shakespeare was not challenged in serious argument. But the increased popularity of Shakespeare's plays after the season of 1734-35, the rise of Garrick in 1741, the series of new editions of Shakespeare were signs of a new point of view. This was not, however, fully expressed in literary criticism, though in 1736 the anonymous⁹ essay *Some Remarks on the Tragedy of Hamlet* attacked the unities, and showed clearly the hostility toward the rules which was characteristic of the followers of Longinus and of Addison, who emphasized sympathetic criticism.

Ten years elapsed before John Upton's timid protest in his *Critical Observations on Shakespeare*¹⁰ (1746). The irrepress-

⁴ The weekly articles of the *Hamburgische Dramaturgie* began May 1, 1767. The attack on *Mérope* began in No. 44.

⁵ *Eighteenth-Century Essays on Shakespeare*, Introduction, pp. ix-xxxviii.

⁶ Preface to *The Great Favourite, or The Duke of Lerma*.

⁷ *Of Poetry*.

⁸ *Discourse upon Comedy*.

⁹ This excellent essay is generally attributed to Sir Thomas Hanmer on the authority of his biographer, Sir Henry Bunbury. See *The Correspondence of Sir Thomas Hanmer*, p. 80. Without offering evidence, Lounsbury (p. 60) questions this attribution.

¹⁰ *Critical Observations on Shakespeare*, pp. 60-65. Second ed., 1748.

ible satirical dramatist, Samuel Foote, was more bold in *Roman and English Comedy Considered and Compared* (1747) but disdained argument. Fielding's ironical fling at the unities in *Tom Jones*¹¹ (1749) is equally bold, but too casual for discussion, like Sterne's attack in *Tristram Shandy*¹² (1761). Dr. Johnson's serious argument in *The Rambler*¹³ (1751) is more important, but Dr. Johnson in 1751 is very different from Dr. Johnson in 1765. He rather deprecates the dogmatism of the critics than trusts to his own convictions.

But with the mid-century, the time had come for bolder and more numerous rebellions. Three of these have not been previously noticed. In 1755, an article in *The Monthly Review*¹⁴ on *L'Orphelin de la Chine* by Voltaire protested against the unity of time as ridiculous and recommended a liberal interpretation of the unity of place. In 1760 the writers of *The Monthly Review* again showed a heterodox tendency by supporting with their approval¹⁵ two new attacks on the rules. "Shakespeare—an Epistle to Mr. Garrick" is an anonymous poem attributed to Robert Lloyd, who published at the same time an "Ode to Genius" attacking "Taste" as inhibiting "Fancy." The protest against the rules in "Shakespeare" is not argumentative and is much less important than that in *An Essay upon the Present State of the Theatre in France, England, and Italy*. The passage in this book which the reviewer singled out for approving quotation¹⁶ is the discussion of the Greek chorus. The chorus, said the anonymous author, required the unities of time and place; but these rules are quite unnecessary in the modern drama.¹⁷ Thus at last, exactly a century after the Restoration, the historical argument enters into the controversy, eight years before it was advanced by Lessing.

The favor which *The Monthly Review* accords to such views shows that the rebels are now much stronger. Daniel Webb, in

¹¹ *Tom Jones*, Book V, ch. 1.

¹² *Tristram Shandy*, Book III, ch. 12.

¹³ *The Rambler*, No. 156.

¹⁴ *Monthly Review*, vol. XIII, pp. 493-505. For the unities, see pp. 494-496.

¹⁵ *Monthly Review*, vol. XXIII, pp. 371-5; vol. XXII, pp. 455-60.

¹⁶ *Ibid.*, vol. XXII, pp. 455-60.

¹⁷ *Present State of the Theatre*, pp. 119-20.

his *Remarks upon the Beauties of Poetry*¹⁸ (1762), carries the war into the enemy's camp by asserting that Shakespeare gains rather than loses by violating the unities. The critics are singularly blind, Webb thinks, to condemn Shakespeare for violating the unities and to praise him for the singular beauty and energy of his sentiments. The virtue springs from the supposed fault. The simple plot is not capable of variety either of incidents or sentiment. It substitutes description for action, and forces the dramatist into countless improbabilities. One is glad to find Webb's original little book favorably reviewed, as it deserves. He is a true precursor of the romantic point of view in his sympathetic attitude toward poetry, and discusses versification and poetic imagery (always with reference to Shakespeare) almost like a disciple of Coleridge. He is, in fact, another sympathetic critic of the "beauties and faults" school, dominated by the eighteenth century interpretation of Longinus.

In the same year, 1762, comes the most important attack upon the unities between Farquhar and Dr. Johnson. This occurs in the three-volume *Elements of Criticism* by the Scotch judge, Henry Home, Lord Kames. Kames's thoughtful and almost too sober book went through seven editions before the end of the eighteenth century and was reviewed with extreme respect. The writer in *The Critical Review*¹⁹ entertains "no doubt, but the *Elements of Criticism* may one day supersede the critical labours of the Stagyrte." History has not confirmed this prophecy and has, indeed, treated Kames with too little rather than too great respect. The book is worthy of considerable attention in the general history of Shakespeare criticism, for it refers to Shakespeare as a standard in the discussion of every subject which regards either poetry or the drama.

We are here concerned only with its treatment of the unities of time and place.²⁰ Kames repeats more fully the historical argument in *The Present State of the Theatre*. The chorus made continuous representation an essential characteristic of Greek drama, and thus made necessary the unities of time and place. They forced many improprieties upon the Greek dramatist, which the

¹⁸ *Beauties of Poetry*, pp. 103-06.

¹⁹ *Critical Review*, vol. XIII, p. 302.

²⁰ *Elements of Criticism*, ch. XXIII.

modern dramatist should be spared, since he has no chorus. But this explanation, while quite sufficient to meet the argument by authority, has little weight against the classical appeal to nature and reason, the argument that the pleasure of dramatic performances is destroyed by the unnatural and unreasonable shifts in time and place. So Kames, with all the authority of his judicial sobriety—a sobriety which he retained in literature more consistently than on the bench—re-stated the arguments of the too emphatic Farquhar. Shifts of time and place require no more of the audience which must follow them in imagination than the other conventions of the drama. Kames, like Farquhar, makes the practical reference to the facts of theatrical experience, which is usually conspicuously absent in the neo-classical age. He speaks frequently of “the waking dream” and the “impression of reality” which an audience must feel in the presence of a good play.

Lounsbury mentions both Webb and Kames, and discusses Kames; but he inclines to give Dr. Johnson and Lessing the credit which really belongs in large part to their predecessors. Johnson and Lessing brought forward no new arguments; and indeed Dr. Johnson's reasoning, aside from its summing-up of Farquhar's essay, is open to very serious criticism. It may easily seem to imply a disbelief not only in literal delusion but also in any kind of dramatic illusion whatever. This was the impression of Coleridge and of the critic who reviewed the Preface in *The Monthly Review*. *The Monthly Review* insists, moreover, that apparent probability rather than literal delusion is the argument for the unities and that Dr. Johnson's reasoning was, therefore, “false, or foreign to the purpose.”²¹ The assertion may be partly supported with regard to England, though not for France. It may justly be said that Dr. Johnson's prestige made his assault upon the unities more significant than those of earlier critics. But one must guard against the tendency to exaggerate Johnson's preëminence. Though their names are now forgotten, Webb enjoyed some public favor, if the reviews may be trusted; and in his way, Kames occupied a most distinguished literary position. Dr. Johnson's literary au-

²¹ *Monthly Review*, vol. XXXIII, p. 298. Nichol Smith (Introduction, lx) gives the impression that *The Monthly Review* defended the unities, which is scarcely the case; it merely attacked Dr. Johnson.

thority was greater than theirs, but not so much greater in the eighteenth as in the twentieth century.

When Dr. Johnson made his famous attack upon the unities in 1765, he said, "I am almost frightened at my own temerity"; and critics have taken the timidity of so dominant a personality as the surest possible proof of the continued power of the unities. One may wonder, however, whether it does not rather indicate the battle of Johnson's essential conservatism with his powerful common sense. The long series of protests against the unities, always growing more frequent, and culminating in the very influential work of Kames, and the general immediate acceptance of Johnson's opinions in the reviews make one think that the ground had been thoroughly prepared.

*The Gentleman's Magazine*²² thought adverse criticism impossible. *The London Magazine*²³ and *The Critical Review*²⁴ both singled out the attack upon the unities for approving quotation, though *The London Magazine* deprecated extreme violations of the rules. *The Monthly Review*²⁵ was very captious throughout and would accept neither Dr. Johnson's arguments in defence of tragedy nor his argument against the unities; yet in each case it gave a reserved approval to his conclusions. "Indeed the point is almost universally given up with regard to the unity of *place*; the preservation of which gives rise to more improbabilities than the breach of it."²⁶ . . . The unity of time, is, indeed, so far essential to the drama, that the successive actions represented must be confined to the time of actual representation; although the intervals between them may be as long as the poet pleases, consistent with the preservation of the unity of character and that of the design of the fable."²⁷ The reviewer, who is very involved, but really thoughtful, seems to draw part of his material from Kames, cen-

²² *Gentleman's Magazine*, vol. XXXV, p. 479.

²³ *London Magazine*, vol. XXXIV, p. 536, n.

²⁴ *Critical Review*, vol. XX, p. 329. *The Critical Review* also objects to Dr. Johnson's deference "to the rules of the French Academy, and the little English writers who adopted them, as the criterions of *taste*." Vol. XX, pp. 321-2.

²⁵ *Monthly Review*, vol. XXXIII, pp. 285-301; 374-89.

²⁶ *Ibid.*, vol. XXXIII, p. 379.

²⁷ *Ibid.*, vol. XXXIII, p. 380.

suring extreme licences like those of *The Winter's Tale*²⁸ and arguing that extreme indifference to the unities of time and place may interfere with the unity of action and with "the unity of character." His chief charge against Dr. Johnson is that already mentioned, the irrelevance of the argument in the Preface. At the end, he seems to turn even against Dr. Johnson's and his own conclusions, saying cautiously that "The unities are essential to the drama, though not in that degree as hath been asserted by the critics."²⁹

Despite the reservations of *The London Magazine* and *The Monthly Review*³⁰ the reviews seem to have given up the dogma of the unities—at least as a dogma. Their opinions are perhaps more valuable in representing the common judgment of literary men than anything which could be said by a man of genius, like Johnson. The number of attacks on the unities immediately before the Preface and the number which succeeded give further proof that it was necessary for Englishmen to read German criticism to free themselves from the fundamental rules of neo-classical dramatic theory.

But the controversy was not yet dead. In 1769 appeared Mrs. Montagu's popular and effusive defence of Shakespeare against Voltaire.³¹ Mrs. Montagu is so patronizing about Shakespeare's irregularities that she gives away by implication the cause which she set out to defend. Her book called forth another, which replied not only to her, but to Dr. Johnson. In 1774, Edward Taylor, who had been too long abroad to sympathize with recent English dramatic criticism, published anonymously his *Cursory Remarks on Tragedy*. The introduction is an answer to Dr. Johnson, and, from the theoretical neo-classical point of view, it answers him well, using arguments similar to those of *The Monthly Review*. But it is belated and isolated, though it found uncertain later echoes in William Richardson's "Faults of Shakespeare"³² (1784), in Thomas Whateley's *Remarks on Some of the Characters of Shakes-*

²⁸ Cf. also *The London Magazine*, vol. xxxiv, p. 536 n.

²⁹ *Ibid.*, vol. xxxiii, p. 381.

³⁰ *The Monthly Review* had in 1755 and 1760 shown greater liberality than in the review of Dr. Johnson's Preface. See notes 14-16 above.

³¹ *An Essay on the Writings and Genius of Shakespeare*.

³² *Essays on Shakespeare's Dramatic Characters*, pp. 112-46, especially 142.

peare³³ (1785), and J. P. Kemble's *Macbeth Reconsidered*³⁴ (1786). It is interesting to note the fact that all of these later writers are among the forerunners of the new criticism of Shakespeare's characterization, and that Kemble, when he revised and amplified his essay in 1817, found it wise to face about and condemn the unities in his introduction.

It is easy to carry further the list of attacks upon the unities. In 1770, the interesting Francis Gentleman, who could not stomach tragi-comedy, nevertheless thought the unities a mere burden to the dramatist.³⁵ In 1775, William Cooke took over Kames's discussion of the unities for his compilation called *The Elements of Dramatic Criticism*.³⁶ The prestige of Kames was indicated again by the appearance of his chapter on the unities in early editions of the *Encyclopaedia Britannica*.³⁷ In 1777, John Berkenhout published his *Biographia Literaria* and abused the unities as unnatural and foolish. *The Monthly Review* disliked his vehemence, though it would not make the unities obligatory, or reproach Shakespeare for violating them.³⁸ In 1783, Hugh Blair followed his friend Kames in his *Lectures on Rhetoric and Belles Lettres*,³⁹ a frequently reprinted work. Blair's habit of patronizing Shakespeare⁴⁰ makes his liberalism on the unities rather unexpected,⁴¹ but all the more significant. In the same year, another Scotch professor, James Beattie, poet and essayist, added the authority of academic conservatism to the side of the erstwhile rebels in his *Dissertations Moral and Critical*.⁴² This book, like Blair's, is composed of university lectures. The students at Aberdeen, then, as well as Edinburgh, were taught that the accepted doctrine was to condemn the unities, that the rules restrain

³³ *Remarks, Introduction*, pp. 1-2.

³⁴ *Macbeth Reconsidered*, p. 1. These three critics are all very mild.

³⁵ *The Dramatic Censor*, vol. I, p. 40.

³⁶ *The Elements of Dramatic Criticism*, ch. XI.

³⁷ *Encyclopaedia Britannica*, 2nd edition, Edinburgh, 1778-82, vol. VIII, pp. 6292-7. Article on "Poetry." I have not had access to the first edition of 1771, but the fourth edition (1810) still retains Kames's discussion.

³⁸ *Monthly Review*, vol. LVII, pp. 191-5. Berkenhout's abuse of the unities is quoted in the review. I have been able to see it only there.

³⁹ *Lectures on Rhetoric*, 1st edition, Lecture XLV, vol. II, pp. 498-501.

⁴⁰ *Ibid.*, vol. I, pp. 41-3, 303, 309; vol. II, pp. 511, 523-4, 542.

⁴¹ Lounsbury (p. 64) counts Blair as a defender of the unities.

⁴² *Dissertations*, pp. 186-7.

genius, create many improbabilities, and are quite useless in creating an impression of reality. Beattie follows Dr. Johnson, and refers to him in a note. In 1786, the learned Reverend Martin Sherlock published *A Fragment on Shakespeare*, pointing out the improbabilities into which the unities lead the dramatist.⁴³ In 1791, the anonymous "W. N.," writing for Anderson's *Bee*,⁴⁴ repeated in two pages all the familiar arguments of the liberals. In 1799, the historian Belsham reechoed Dr. Johnson's Preface in *Essays Historical and Literary*.⁴⁵ By the beginning of the nineteenth century, no one, surely, could consider himself a radical in following such a long series of rebels.⁴⁶

The modern student of the drama will be forcibly impressed by the limitations of the controversy over the unities. The supporters of the rules leaned heavily on the authority of the ancients, the dramatists as well as Aristotle; but the argument was essentially weak as soon as it was pointed out that the absence of the chorus changed conditions. The argument from nature and reason was strong theoretically, but it could not endure reference to the actual imaginative experience of the audience in following shifts of time and place. The constant performance of Shakespeare's plays furnished all the evidence necessary for this comparison of theory and fact. But a third argument was possible, although there was no one to exemplify its power until the rise of Ibsen. This is the aesthetic and formal argument, based on the concentration of emotion of the retrospective drama. This type of play was the natural ideal of the neo-classicist. But in less skilful hands than Ibsen's—even in the hands of Racine—it meant not mental action, full of suspense, but the absence of action and the substitution of description. This was pointed out by Webb, and there was no reply possible. The growth of Shakespeare's fame might have been delayed if a dramatist like Ibsen had arisen in the eighteenth century to demonstrate anew the possibilities of the 'regular' drama.

THOMAS M. RAYSOR.

State College of Washington.

⁴³ *A Fragment on Shakespeare*, pp. 34-5.

⁴⁴ Anderson's *Bee*, vol. I, pp. 61-62.

⁴⁵ *Essays*, vol. II, p. 551. I have not seen this book and am indebted to Lounsbury (p. 65), for the reference.

⁴⁶ Of the nine references cited, Lounsbury mentions four: Cooke, Berkenhout, Beattie, Belsham.

NATHAN AND NATHANIEL FIELD

It is only recently that a question has arisen concerning the correctness of the name *Nathaniel* Field for Field, the clever "son of Ben" and actor second in rank only to Burbage. In spite of the fact that the parish registers of St. Giles Cripplegate record a *Nathaniell Feilde*, 1581, and a *Nathan Feilde*, 1587, both sons of that controversial Puritan minister, John Field, the similarity of name has led to the fusion of the identity of Nathaniel, the printer, and Nathan, the actor-playwright. It was assumed that John Field could not have had two living sons with these names. That this assumption was based on insufficient evidence is shown by the fact that in naming his sons Nathan and Nathaniel, John Field was only completing an odd quartette begun with John, 1572, and Jonathan, 1577. John and Jonathan seem to have preserved distinct identities, but Nathan and Nathaniel became almost hopelessly confused. For all the importance of the person Nathan, it is the name Nathaniel which has been preserved by fame. Nathan has been given his brother's publishing business in addition to his own profession; his brother's place of residence; his brother's wife and five children; and, as if this were not enough, the additional thirteen or more years of life enjoyed by Nathaniel after Nathan's death.

The history of this confusion of names is an interesting one. The first time that the name Nathaniel occurs in connection with the actor is in two of the six actor lists recorded in the 1679 folio of the Beaumont-Fletcher plays. Here in the actor lists of *The Loyal Subject* and *The Mad Lover* the name is given *Nathanaell*. Before that time all the formal documents referring to the actor give the name *Nathan*. In the account of his impressment for the Chapel Royal¹ the name is *Nathan ffeilde*. The agreement with Henslowe and Meade in regard to the Hope Theatre² is made by *Nathan ffeilde gent*. The name appears as Nathan in Cunningham's record of the payment for the court performance of *Bartholomew Fair*, November 1, 1614;³ in the Patent for the

¹ Fleay, F. G. *A Chronicle History of the London Stage*, 128.

² Greg, W. W. *Henslowe Papers*, 23.

³ Cunningham, Peter. *Extracts from the Accounts of the Revels at the Court in the Reign of Queen Elizabeth and King James I*, p. xlv.

King's Men,⁴ March 27, 1619; in the Livery Allowance,⁵ May 19, 1619; in the documents of the Witter-Heming's case where reference is made to his share in the Globe;⁶ in the 1623 folio of Shakespeare's plays; in the *Sharers Papers* of 1635⁷ in the entry in the *Stationers' Register* of the collaborative play, *The Jeweler of Amsterdam*;⁸ and below his portrait in Dulwich College. In other contemporary documents the name is found in abbreviated form, never as Nathaniel. The actor lists of the Jonson plays give *Nat*; Field's early commendatory verses are signed *Nat.*, *Nath.*, or *N. F.*; Chapman's verses are addressed to *Nat Field*; and Field's letters to Henslowe are signed *Nat*. Yet in the face of all the above evidence every early biographer, beginning with Langbaine in *Momus Triumphans* (1688), gives the name of the player as Nathaniel. Until recently these biographers have been followed in this error by even the most reputable scholars. The very first person to suspect the confusion of names was Joseph Hunter. In the manuscript biographical sketches, *Chorus Vatum*,⁹ Hunter calls Field the player "a wild irregular person" and tries to get around identifying him as the son of the Puritan minister. He says, however, "If it should ever turn out that Field the actor was son of John Field, the divine, I should think that the entry of the apprenticeship belongs to Nathaniel the son born 1581 and that it was Nathan born 1587 who was the actor." William Rendle in his book, *Old Southwark and Its People*, correctly refers to the player as Nathan.¹⁰ No one else has returned to Nathan his individuality until Mr. E. K. Chambers in the *Elizabethan Stage*¹¹ boldly printed the conclusion that I was attempting to maintain in my doctorate thesis of the same year,—namely, that Nathan was himself and not his brother. Since that time Mr.

⁴ Hazlitt, W. C. *The English Drama and Stage*, 50-52.

⁵ *Historical Manuscripts Commission*, IV, 299.

⁶ Wallace, C. W. *Shakespeare and His London Associates*, Univ. of Neb. Studies, x, 1910, p. 63.

⁷ Halliwell-Phillipps, J. O. *Outlines*, I, 312.

⁸ Eyre and Rivington. *Transcript of the Stationers' Register*, I, 445.

⁹ Hunter, Joseph. *Chorus Vatum Anglicanorum*, Add. ms. Brit. Mus. 24490.

¹⁰ Rendle, William. *Old Southwark and Its People*, 175.

¹¹ Chambers, E. K. *Elizabethan Stage*, II, 316.

T. W. Baldwin has written in support of the theory that Nathaniel, the publisher, and Nathan, the actor, were identical.¹²

Instead of questioning this matter of dual personality, biographers who have been aware of the two baptismal entries have gone to various lengths in accounting for the similarity of name. Collier, for example, assumed that Nathaniel Field died in infancy since a second son was named Nathan. He did not, however, suggest the death of John to account for Jonathan! He ignored the fact that there is no record of any such death in the parish registers of St. Giles Cripplegate, although these registers contain an unusually complete account of the Field family. Various biographers have overlooked the inconsistency of attributing the apprenticeship of Nathaniel to Nathan when Nathan was not even nine years old and was probably then attending St. Paul's Grammar School in which he was a scholar when he was impressed for the Chapel Royal in 1600.

How did this vexing problem of Nathan versus Nathaniel originate? Was it due to the two actor lists of the Beaumont-Fletcher folio or had the names become confused earlier? Some basis for the interchange, it seems to me, extends as far back as the baptismal records of the parish of St. Anne Blackfriars, 1619-27. The first two entries of the children of Nathaniel and Anne Field give the name of the father as Nathan, but the appearance of the entry indicates abbreviation. One of these entries is corrected in the register; when the second child died, the record of his burial gives him as the son of Nathaniel and Anne Field. Collier seems not to have noted this fact, and even Mr. Chambers assumes that children of both Nathan and Nathaniel are given in these registers.¹³ Of course each of the brothers might have married an Anne just to carry on the joke in names, but that they did not have so keen a sense of humor not only is indicated by the comparison of the entries in the parish registers mentioned above, but is definitely proved by two letters of administration found among the documents of Somerset House.

The first and most important of these is the grant of letters of administration to Dorcas, the second child of John Field, who

¹² Baldwin, T. W. "Nathaniel Field and Robert Wilson," in *MLN.*, January, 1926, p. 32.

¹³ Chambers, *op. cit.*, 317.

married Edward Rice,¹⁴ giving her the administration of the goods of Nathan Field.¹⁵ In this brief document we learn several things about the actor-playwright. The date of his death is fixed between May 19, 1619, when his name appears in the Livery Allowance, and August 2, 1620, when the above letters of administration were granted. Field's sudden and mysterious disappearance from the stage is thus explained by a very natural cause—his death; and Mr. Fleay's theory of Field's departure because of jealousy over Taylor's taking the leading rôles after Burbage's death, is proved empty fiction.¹⁶ It has been impossible for me to ascertain the exact date of Field's death. It seems quite likely that he was gone from the stage before the production of *Sir John van Olden Barnevelt* in August 1619, for his name does not appear among the actors listed in the stage directions and the vacancy is filled by that of John Rice, whose name again appears in the Livery List of 7 April 1621. From the Letters of Administration we learn that Nathan Field was a bachelor and that at the time of his death he resided in the parish of St. Giles-in-the-Fields. The latter fact is especially interesting because in 1616 Field was a parishioner of St. Savior's (Southwark Cathedral). In his reply to the attack on players made by Mr. Sutton, the minister, Field accuses Sutton of having hindered him from the sacrament and attempted to banish him from his "owne parishe church."¹⁷ It seems possible, therefore, that Sutton succeeded in forcing Field from the church.

The Commission reads as follows:

The second day (of August 1620) a commission was granted to Dorcas Rice otherwise Feild natural and lawful sister of Nathan Feild late of the parish of Saint Giles in the county of Middlesex bachelor deceased having etc. to administer the good rights and credits of the deceased etc. sworn.

The second document referred to above is the commission granted on March 26, 1632 (1633) to Anne Field for the administration of the goods of her husband, Nathaniel.¹⁸

¹⁴ Marriage Register, St. Giles Cripplegate, 9 November, 1690.

¹⁵ Admon. Act Book, P. C. C., Aug. 2, 1620; in Somerset House, London.

¹⁶ Fleay, F. G. *Biographical Chronicle of the English Drama*, I, 173.

¹⁷ *S. P. DOM. JAC.*, I, LXXXIX, 105.

¹⁸ *Probate and Admon. Act Book*, 1632, P. C. C., Somerset House, London.

On the 26th day of March 1632 Letters of Administration were granted to Anne Feild relict of Nathaniel Feild late of the parish of Saint Anne Blackfryers London intestate deceased to administer the goods credits chattels etc. of the said deceased etc.

This is the Nathaniel whose children are entered in the registers of Saint Anne Blackfriars and whose burial is recorded there under the date, February 20, 1632 (1633).

Since we can no longer make one biography serve for the two brothers, it becomes necessary to suggest the known biographical facts for each. Relatively little is known about Nathaniel. He was the fifth child of that famous Puritan divine, the learned Doctor Field, and was born 13 June, 1581, when the Field family was undergoing many vicissitudes. His father was either then in Newgate to which he had been sent for a second period by the Ecclesiastical Commission, or he had been recently released by the intervention of the Earl of Leicester.¹⁹ In 1596 he was apprenticed to Ralph Jackson, Stationer, of London.²⁰ Though the entry names the period of apprenticeship as eight years, Nathaniel did not take up his freedom until 1611.²¹ He seems to have found difficulty in entering into his profession, for it is not until 1624 that the Stationers' Register records the license of a book for Nathaniel Field. Field is associated with Thomas Harper, who also took up his freedom in 1611.²² Between the years 1624 and 1628 five sermons by Theophilus Field, Nathaniel's brother, are licensed to Nathaniel Field and Thomas Harper.²³ The last entry to Nathaniel Field is November 9, 1627.²⁴ This is of the book called "The true historye of the tragique loves of Hipolito and Isabella," which is interesting because it contains verses by Chapman, the friend of Nathan. After the above date Thomas Harper continued publishing, but there is no mention of Field. Between the years 1619 and 1627 the parish registers of Saint Anne Blackfriars record the birth of five children and the burial of two of these in infancy. All else that we know about Nathaniel is found in the record of his death and in the previously mentioned Letters of Administration

¹⁹ Brit. Mus. Cotton. ms. Titus B VII, fol. 22. Letter to the Earl of Leicester, Nov. 25, 1581.

²⁰ *Ibid.*, III, 29.

²¹ Arber, II, 215.

²² *Ibid.*, IV, 133, 137, 167, 191.

²³ *Ibid.*, II, 215 and III, 683.

²⁴ *Ibid.*, IV, 188.

granted to his "relict" Anne. At his death the oldest child was a daughter of fourteen. The family was left with property appraised at only £45, 14s, 6d.

The life of Nathan is both more interesting and more important. Born March, 1587, he escaped the ministerial influence of his father, who died March, 1588. If John Field had lived to shape the ideals of his son, the stage would probably have lost one of its best actors and most interesting minor playwrights. John Field would never have allowed a son of his to cast a wishful eye toward theatres, which he termed "sincks of synne," for he thought of players as evil men and of plays as "the schooles of as great wickednesses as can be." But Nathan was to become the proverbial black sheep of the fold, for in 1600 when he was attending St. Paul's Grammar School, he was seized for the Chapel Royal by the authority of the Queen's commission to Nathaniel Giles.²⁵ Ben Jonson took an interest in Nathan and is quoted by Drummond as saying, "Nid Field was his schollar, and he had read to him the Satyres of Horace and some Epigrams of Martiall."²⁶ Soon Nathan was taking leading rôles in Jonson's plays and in the other plays produced by the Children. During the nineteen years of his dramatic career, he was also connected with the Children of the Queen's Revels at Blackfriars and at Whitefriars, with Henslowe's company at the Hope, and with the King's Men. As actor he attained a rank second only to Burbage. In 1609-10 and about 1611 he wrote two sparkling comedies, *Woman Is a Weathercock* and *Amends for Ladies*. After these youthful efforts he entered into collaborative writing with Massinger and Fletcher. Just when his work had become so much like that of Beaumont that it is almost impossible to distinguish the composition of the two, Nathan Field disappeared from the stage, and we know only the fact of his death as given in the Letters of Administration granted to his sister August 2, 1620.

R. FLORENCE BRINKLEY.

Goucher College.

²⁵ Wallace, C. W. *Children of the Chapel at Blackfriars*, 61.

²⁶ Drummond, William. *Conversations*. ed. Laing, 11.

DRYDEN'S RELATIONS WITH HOWARD AND ORRERY

Dryden's relations during his early years in London with Sir Robert Howard, son of Thomas Howard, Earl of Berkshire, have been known only from the clues afforded by his prefatory poem in Howard's volume of verses, published in 1660; by his marriage to Howard's sister on December 1, 1663; and by his collaboration with Howard in the composition of *The Indian Queen*. One other source of information, generally regarded as of doubtful value, is Thomas Shadwell's satirical poem on Dryden, *The Medal of John Bayes*. In this poem Shadwell sets forth Dryden's relations with Howard at that period as follows:¹

Then by th' assistance of a Noble Knight,
Th' hadst plenty, ease, and liberty to write.
First like a Gentleman he made thee live;
And on his Bounty thou didst amply thrive.

No historical substantiation of Shadwell's statements has ever been discovered by Dryden's numerous biographers, so far as I have been able to observe. The Sloane collection of manuscripts in the British Museum contains, however, a letter² which furnishes evidence of the greatest interest. This letter has escaped apparently the notice of scholars, for it reveals a new and important fact in Dryden's biography—namely, that in the summer of 1663 Dryden was living with Howard in Lincoln's Inn Fields, London, and seemingly had been residing with him for some time previous.

The letter in question is written to Sir Robert Howard by Sir Andrew Henley, First Bart. of Bramshill, Co. Hants, and of Henley, co. Somerset, and reads as follows:

Sr.

I had as ill luck as yor self in missing you one munday whe[n] I made sure of being one the guard or at Winchester sessions, I rode Directly thither and in that Confidence Answered not yor Letters nor Excused my not meeting at yor Rendezvous, All which must now be Remidied all the wayes I can: for my part had I not missed you I had not beene at Sessions yor request to us had not recd such Dispatch as now it Did, The

¹ 1682 ed., p. 8.

² Sloane MS. 813, f. 71.

objections are not weighty Enough to be Delybred in a Letter but soe strong that they had hindred yor satisfactiōe; next the business of the house must be menconed in which all yt I can say is that for the serge Bed Mr Dreidon useth that bed you lye in and the little green serge furniture I shall use at Bramshill as the pewter, All the other things I desire may be valued and that by one of yor and another of my Choosing, And I hope you will Think what I put in new into the house when you Came to it little the worse for using and all that I can I will take for my owne use thereof And besides particularly the furniture of the Dying Roome but for the tyme I referr that to yor owne Conveniency, In this and all other transactions I desyre to appeare under no other Character then of

Yor most affectionat friend,

Bramshill 8"

& very humble servant

8ber 1663

Andrew Henley

For Sr Robert Howard

In Lincolns In feilds the sixth

Doore from Turnstyle Holborne Row

London these

The foregoing letter discloses as a most natural circumstance the collaboration of Dryden and Howard in the composition of *The Indian Queen* during the fall of 1663. It is a close parallel to the famous Beaumont and Fletcher situation. Here were Dryden and Howard, both of whom previously had written plays independently,* now living together in bachelor's quarters. Under such conditions it is not at all surprising that Dryden, ambitious for fame but as yet a dramatic poet of no reputation, should collaborate with Howard, who already had an influential place at court, and a controlling position in the management of the Theatre Royal as one of its chief shareholders.

Dryden's great intimacy with Howard also seems the likely cause for his introduction to Roger Boyle, Earl of Orrery, while the latter was residing in Ireland between 1661 and 1664. The Earl of Orrery had married Margaret Howard, daughter of Theophilus Howard, Earl of Suffolk, who was brother to Thomas Howard, Earl of Berkshire. Thus by marriage Dryden's patron and Orrery were first cousins. Dryden himself in 1663 became of kin to Orrery by his marriage to Lady Elizabeth Howard, the

* Dryden: *The Wild Gallant* (T. R. Feb. 1662/3); Howard: *The Surprisal* (T. R. 1662).

sister of his patron. Dryden sent Orrery in Ireland specimens of his writings, seeking his counsel and favor. Of this literary correspondence Dryden writes in the *Epistle Dedicatory to The Rival Ladies*:⁴

But for this confidence of my dedication, I have an argument, which is too advantageous for me to publish it to the world. It is the kindness your lordship has continually shown to all my writings. You have been pleased, my lord, they should sometimes cross the Irish seas, to kiss your hands; which passage (contrary to the experience of others) I have found the least dangerous in the world. Your favor has shown upon me at a remote distance, without the least knowledge of my person; and (like the influence of the heavenly bodies) you have done good, without knowing to whom you did it. It is this virtue in your lordship, which emboldens me to this attempt; for, did I not consider you as my patron, I have little reason to desire you for my judge:

The kinship of Dryden and Orrery through the Howard family has never been noted, and even their literary acquaintance previous to 1664 has been quite overlooked. Yet these facts hint at probable connections of considerable literary influence between Dryden, Howard, and Orrery as regards the early composition of "heroic plays."

The most striking innovation in *The Indian Queen*, the first "heroic play" to be actually produced on the London stage, was to the Restoration audience the dialogue in heroic rimed verse throughout. As early as December, 1660, however, the possible use of rimed verse in English serious plays, following the prevailing French fashion, had been warmly discussed in the literary circle around Charles II. The Earl of Orrery had been a leading proponent for the innovation, and at the behest of the King had written a play entirely in heroic couplets soon after he had settled in Ireland at the beginning of 1661.⁵ This piece, the pioneer "heroic play," was *The General*.⁶ It so pleased the King that he in time gave it to Thomas Killigrew to be acted at the new Theatre Royal, which was to open the spring of 1663. Without question *The General*

⁴ *Works* (Scott & Saintsbury edit.), vol. 2, p. 131.

⁵ See Morrice's *Memoirs*, p. 81, in Orrery's *State Letters* (Dublin, 1743), vol. 1; also *State Letters*, vol. 1, p. 76.

⁶ See for evidence on these points concerning the history of *The General* my note, *Heroic Plays of the Earl of Orrery*, in the *Review of English Studies*, April, 1926, p. 206-11.

in manuscript form circulated during 1661 and 1662 among the court "wits" and created a stir by the novelty of its verse. If Dryden and Howard had not seen a manuscript of *The General* before Killigrew received his copy from the King, Howard in all probability procured Killigrew's copy for their perusal. The high favor which Orrery's experiment in rimed verse won with Charles and his literary coterie increased, no doubt, the interest of Dryden and Howard in the possibilities of rime for the dialogue of regular stage plays. The fact that the actual innovator of the fashion was a relative and a personal, literary acquaintance must have also added to their interest. Perhaps the scattered passages of rime in *The Rival Ladies*, generally conceded to have been written in 1663, are the result of Dryden's efforts to imitate in a tentative manner the form of verse he had recently observed employed successfully in Orrery's play, for he thus begins his *Epistle Dedicatory to The Rival Ladies*:

This worthless present was designed you long before it was a play; when it was only a confused mass of thoughts, tumbling over one another in the dark. . . . And I confess, in that first tumult of my thoughts, there appeared a disorderly kind of beauty in some of them, which gave me hope something worthy of my Lord of Orrery might be drawn from them.

Then the appearance of another and finer play by Orrery in rimed verse, *Henry V*, must have still more attracted the attention and thought of Dryden and Howard toward the new fashion of dramatic writing. The manuscript of *Henry V* reached London at least by the fall of 1663, for on or before November 3 Davenant had the play licensed for production.⁷ There can be but little question that both Dryden and Howard had an early opportunity to read or hear about the play, and that in consequence they should be more inclined than ever to try their own hands at a dramatic composition in rimed verse, which promised speedily to come into popular vogue because of the favor it was receiving in high places.

Sometime probably in the late fall of 1663 Dryden and Howard, living under the same roof, determined to write a play entirely in heroic rimed verse, as Orrery had done, and to produce it speedily that it might be the "hit" of the winter theatrical season.

⁷ *The Dramatic Records of Sir Henry Herbert* (edit. by J. Q. Adams), p. 138.

The Indian Queen, first performed at the Theatre Royal in January, 1664, was the result. It lived up to the expectation of its authors by winning the greatest applause and by establishing on the Restoration stage the popularity of the heroic couplet in serious plays—a popularity which continued for a decade.

Such appears to be the story of the composition of the first "heroic play" which appeared on the stage. The example of the pioneer plays by the Earl of Orrery plus the direct, personal relations existing between Dryden, Howard, and Orrery, seem the chief influences that occasioned the writing of *The Indian Queen* in rimed verse. Is not the truth of this view borne out by the fact that, when Dryden came to write in the summer of 1664 a dedicatory preface to *The Rival Ladies*, the most important feature of which play he plainly considered the scenes in rime, he chose to address the preface to the Earl of Orrery? His preface is largely concerned with a discussion of "the new way of writing scenes in verse." He concludes his arguments in favor of "the new way" with these words:⁸

But, my lord, though I have more to say upon this subject, yet I must remember, it is your lordship to whom I speak; who have much more commended this way by your writing in it, than I can do by writing for it. Where my reasons cannot prevail, your lordship's example must.

Amherst College.

WILLIAM S. CLARK.

AN EARLY VERSION OF VOLTAIRE'S *A MONSIEUR LOUIS RACINE*

In *M. L. N.*, XL, III, 189, I called attention to an early printing of Voltaire's verses against Louis Racine's *De la Grâce*. In the *Examen du Poème sur la Grâce*, a publication of 1723 containing two letters to L. Racine in reference to his poem, there is a second version which seems to have escaped the attention of Voltaire's bibliographers. The variants from the edition of 1722, as found in this obscure pamphlet (p. 93), are as follows: line 1, *tes vers didactiques* (this reading appears in later versions); l. 2, *les dogmes fanatiques*; l. 6, *mon culte* (usual reading of later editions); l. 9, *Cesse donc de flatter*.

Davidson College.

GEORGE B. WATTS.

⁸ *Works* (Scott & Saintsbury edit.), vol. 2, p. 139.

LUDWIG TIECK'S LIBRARY

Nothing throws more light upon the multifariousness of Ludwig Tieck's literary interests and upon his consuming love for books than his remarkable library. When he had reached the age of seventy-six and could no longer use it to advantage, he decided, being presumably also in need of ready money, to dispose of it. It was sold at auction in Berlin on December 10, 1849, and the following days by the firm of A. Asher and Company. The catalog of this sale has fortunately come down to us.¹

An examination of the original Asher catalog of 1849 discloses a total of 7930 titles. But the number is considerably increased by the fact that now and then entire collections are listed as a single unit. Thus Calderon, according to this plan, shows only ten titles, but one of them, his entire *Teatro*, alone comprises about 150 separate titles and numbers. Similarly the complete *Teatro espagnol*, about 1300 numbers, is listed as a unit. A conservative estimate leads me to believe that the Tieck library contained over 9500 actual titles and considerably over 12,000 volumes. That in sheer size this was a quite remarkable private collection for those days is readily shown by comparison. The famous library of Karl Lachmann, for instance, sold also at auction by Asher in 1852, contained only 5979 titles, that is, several thousand less.

The Tieck catalog falls into six major divisions, viz. A. Language and Literature (4333 numbers), B. History (2365 numbers), C. Literary History and Bibliography (364 numbers), D. Drama (160 numbers), E. Miscellanies: Theology, Philosophy, Archaeology, etc. (733 numbers) and F. Addenda (75 numbers).

Under A. German and Spanish literatures are best represented with 1619 and about 1800 numbers, respectively.

The German collection is surprisingly complete. Alphabetically every author of any importance at all, from Abraham a Santa Clara to Zschokke, is listed. Goethe's works are present in 80 titles, among

¹ Catalogue de la Bibliothèque célèbre de M. Ludwig Tieck qui sera vendue à Berlin le 10. Décembre 1849 et jours suivants par MM. A. Asher et Comp. Berlin, 1849. Imprimé chez Trowetzsch et fils. 362 pp. What remained of the library after this sale was listed again one year later by the same firm in another catalog.

them many first editions; Schiller has 35 titles, among them the rare *Versuch über den Zusammenhang der tierischen Natur des Menschen mit seiner geistigen* (Stuttgart, 1780). Jean Paul has about 30 numbers, including an English translation, *The Death of an Angel and other Pieces* (London, 1839). Remarkably enough Friedrich Schlegel's novel *Lucinde*, which we know Tieck admired at first but later despised, is missing. Tieck's own writings, of course, are well represented by about 30 titles, including translations into English and Danish. It is interesting to note that Tieck possessed also a copy of the pirated Nicolai edition of his own works in 12 volumes (1799). Of Heine he had only *Atta Troll*, *Buch der Lieder*, *Über Ludwig Börne* (2 editions) and the tragedies. Grimm's fairy tales are present only in the English translation of E. Taylor. Of Grabbe Tieck had merely *Das Theater zu Düsseldorf*, and E. T. A. Hoffmann the *Seltsame Leiden eines Theaterdirektors*, the *Nachstücke*, the *Nachlass des Katers Murr* and *Aus Hoffmanns Leben und Nachlass*. Of the other writers of the classical period Bodmer, Bürger, Gellert, Gessner, Gleim, Hagedorn, Haller, Hebel, Heinse, Herder, Hippel, Iffland, Jacobi, Klinger, Klopstock, Kotzebue, Lavater, Leisewitz, Lenz, Lessing, Lichtenberg, Lichtwer, Matthisson, Mendelssohn, Moser, Pfeffel, Rabener, Ramler, Seume, Stilling, the Stolbergs, Thümmel and Wieland are all fairly well represented. Earlier works, among them those of the minnesingers, the great epics (among them nine editions of the *Nibelungenlied*), Sachs, Fischart, Murner, Luther, Rollenhagen, Frischlin and the writers of the seventeenth century, are unusually well represented, often in very old and rare editions, as we shall see.

The Spanish section consists mainly of a wonderfully complete collection of Spanish dramas. In addition, over 50 numbers are devoted to Cervantes.

Second only to the German and Spanish sections are the English (about 750 numbers) and the Italian (700 numbers) collections. Shakespeare alone covers over 100 numbers. Chaucer too is well represented. *Beowulf* is present in a German translation. In the Italian collection Dante, Boccaccio, Gozzi and Goldoni are prominent.

The French collection, with 400 numbers, is notable too, the emphasis being placed upon the classics. Rétif de la Bretonne,

whose influence upon *William Lovell* has been proved, is present in 13 numbers.

Other languages—Asiatic (about 60 titles, all in translation); Portuguese (several dozen); Greek (about 100); Dutch (about 40); Latin (about 110); Scandinavian (about 90); and Slavonic (about 20, all in translation)—are far from neglected. It has been noted that works in Asiatic and Slavonic literatures are represented in translation, mostly German. The other languages are represented partly by original works, partly by translations. Thus Tieck had Homer in German (Voss), English (Pope) and Spanish (Perez); Euripides in Greek, Latin and German; Aristophanes in German and French, Lucian in German; Terence in Latin, German and English; Ovid in German, Italian, French and Dutch (14 numbers); and Vergil in Latin, German, English, Spanish and French.

The historical section, including also biography, geography and travel, is large, as we have seen. The fact that about 400 titles—over one-sixth of the total—deal with America, particularly Spanish America, is notable.

Of the histories of literature, particularly German literature, Tieck possessed Denina, *La Prusse littéraire sous Frédéric II* (Berlin, 1790-1791), Bouterwek, *Geschichte der Poesie und Beredsamkeit* (12 volumes, Göttingen, 1801-1819), Horn, *Geschichte und Kritik der deutschen Poesie und Beredsamkeit* (Berlin, 1805), and the same author's *Poesie und Beredsamkeit der Deutschen* (4 volumes, Berlin, 1823-1829), Koberstein (in two editions, 1827 and 1837), Gervinus, *Zur Geschichte der deutschen Literatur* (Heidelberg, 1834) and the same author's history of German literature (1840-1842), and Wolfgang Menzel's work on the same subject.

Tieck's collection of works on philosophy and related subjects is interesting because it throws light upon his attitude toward that field. Here as nowhere else do we find gaps that stamp him as one uninterested in the abstruse problems of philosophy. Thus he had none of the philosophical writings of Leibnitz or Descartes. Spinoza is well represented by Berthold Auerbach's German translation (1841). But of Kant he had only the *Kritik der reinen Vernunft*. Hegel is missing altogether; Schelling is represented only by a pamphlet on the *Jenaische Literaturzeitung*, volume 2 of

Zeitschrift für spekulative Physik, and *Bruno*; Fichte is present in 13 titles; Schleiermacher's *Reden über die Religion* and *Vertraute Briefe über die Lucinde* are included; of Feuerbach we find only *Merkwürdige Rechtsfälle* (1839); of Swedenborg the *Theologische Schriften* (1789); of Tieck's close friend Solger the *Philosophische Gespräche* (1. Sammlung, 1817) and *Erwin*; and of Jerusalem *Philosophische Aufsätze* (edited by Lessing, 1776); and of Jacobi three philosophical papers. Of Jakob Böhme, who we know influenced Tieck very early in life, there are *Alle göttliche Schriften* (edition of 1715) and *Morgenröte im Aufgang* (1780). Naturally enough G. H. Schubert is prominent, both his *Ansichten von der Nachtseite der Naturwissenschaft* (1808) and his *Symbolik des Traumes* (1814) being listed.

In the field of early Germanic literature Tieck had the older *Edda* both in Swedish and German, the *Snorra-Edda* (1818), the *Heldenbuch* (Hagenau, 1509—a very rare edition), and Snorri's *Heimskringla* (Stockholm, 1697) and *Konungasögur* (Holm, 1816). He had also the Zahn edition of *Ulfilas* (Weissenfels, 1805).

The following titles, too, are worthy of note: the *Sakuntala* in English, C. Lassen's *Anthologia Sanscrita* (Bonn, 1838), the *Arabian Nights* in German, French and English, H. H. Wilson's dictionary of Sanscrit and English (Calcutta, 1832), also Yates's *Sanscrit dictionary* (Calcutta, 1846), a *Neu-eingerichtetes Deutsch-Arabisches Wörterbuch* (Oettingen, 1764), one work in Bohemian, a Russian grammar in French by Gretsche (St. Petersburg, 1837), a book of Serbian poetry, a Wendish grammar in German, Voltiggi's *Illirisch-italienisch-und deutsches Wörterbuch und Grammatik*, and J. Long, *Voyages and travels of an Indian interpreter and trader, describing the manners and customs of the North American Indians, with a vocabulary of the Chippeway language* (London, 1791).

I shall close this account with a list of some of the incunabula and other early and rare prints which formed a part of Tieck's remarkable collection: Wolfram von Eschenbach, *Tyturell*, s. l. fol., 1477; *Cosmographiae introductio*, Deudatae, 1507; *Das Heldenbuch*, Hagenaw, 1509; Murner, *Die geuchmat*, Basel, 1519; *Olivier de Castille* (2 tales tr. from French into German by W. Ziely, Basel, 1521); *Fier-a-Bras*, *Eyn schöne kurtzweylige history*

von eym mächtigen Riesen us Hispanien, Fierrabras genannt, fol. Siemern, 1533; *Pontus, Eyn rhumreich . . . histori von dem . . . Ritter Ponto*, Strassburg, 1539; Boccaccio, *Cento Novella Joh. Boccattij. Hundert neue Historien* etc., Strassburg, 1540; Chaucer, London, Bonham, 1542; Vitruvius (German edition), Nürnberg, 1548; Sachs, *Sehr herrliche . . . Gedicht* (vols. 1 and 2), Nürnberg, 1558 and 1560; *Reynicke Voss*, Frankfurt a. M., 1562; Geiler von Keyserberg, Basel, 1574; Fischart, *Binenkorb*, Christlingen, 1581 (also an edition of 1584); Frischlin, *Phasma*, Greifswald, 1593; Rollenhagen, *Froschmeuseler*, Magdeburg, 1595.

The following seventeenth-century prints also belonged to Tieck's library: Jac. Ayser, *Opus Theatricum*, Nürnberg, 1618; Fleming, *Geist- und Weltliche Poemata*, Jena, 1651 (also Merseburg, 1685); Gryphius, *Poetische Wälder*, Frankfurt and Leipzig, 1698; Lohenstein (plays and poems), Breslau, 1685-1689; Mühlforth, *Teutsche Gedichte*, Breslau, 1698; Neumark, *Der neu sprossende Palmbaum*, Nürnberg, 1668; Opitz, *Acht Bücher deutscher Poematum*, Breslau, 1625; Schottelius, *Ausführliche Arbeit von der teutschen Hauptsprache*, Braunschweig, 1663; *Simplicissimus*, Mömpelgart, 1669; Weckherlin, *Weltliche und geistliche Gedichte*, Amsterdam, 1648; Chr. Weise (plays in various seventeenth-century editions); Zesen, *Hochdeutsche Helikonische Hechel*, Hamburg, 1668.

Apart from the significance of this catalog as an index of Tieck's bibliophile and literary interests, I would point out its importance for all scholars engaged in Tieck research.

EDWIN H. ZEYDEL.

University of Cincinnati.

TACITUS, HENRY VI, PART III, AND NERO.

In *M. L. N.*, for November, 1910, I pointed out the close resemblance between *Nero*, III, 4, and a portion of *Henry VI*, Part III, II, 5.¹ In *Nero*, a Man and Woman enter during the burning

¹ References are to H. P. Horne's edition of *Nero*, in the "Mermaid Series" volume, *Nero and Other Plays*, and to W. A. Neilson's *Shakespeare's Complete Works*, "Cambridge Edition."

of Rome; one bears the body of his father, the other that of her child. They mourn their bereavement, and retire, cursing Nero, who has been a spectator. In the Shakespearian play, as King Henry is passing the time during the battle of Towton in meditating upon the preferability of a shepherd's life to a king's, a Son enters, with the body of his father whom he has slain. Recognizing his victim, he laments his parent. A Father now enters, with the corpse of his son, whom he has killed. Again comes a lament; and the two unfortunates bewail their losses together, assisted by the King.

When discussing these two incidents in my earlier article, I derived that in *Nero* from the scene in *Henry VI*. I do not feel inclined to change my opinion. There is, however, an occurrence in Roman history, related by Tacitus of a time slightly later than that of Nero, which may quite likely have been in the mind of the author of this portion of *Henry VI, Part III*, during the composition of the passage in question.

The narrative of this event is to be found in Chapter 25 of Book III of the *Historiae* of Tacitus,² in which is described the battle near Cremona between the forces of Otho and those of Vitellius. The historian says:

That which above all made the carnage memorable was the slaughter of a father by his son. I report the event and the names on the authority of Vipstanus Messala. Julius Mansuetus, originally from Spain, had entered the legion of Rapax. He had left a son who was then a child. The boy, on growing up, had been enrolled in his turn in the seventh legion raised by Galba. Chance having opposed him to his father, he wounds his parent, strikes him down, and as he searches his victim, he recognizes his father, and is recognized by him. Then he embraces his dying parent, and in a distressed voice supplicates the paternal manes to be appeased. and not to turn from him as from a parricide. It was the crime of the State for what else is the part of a soldier in a civil war? At the same time he took up the corpse, dug a grave, and paid his father the last rites. Those who were near him knew of this occurrence first; others learned later; and gradually in the whole army it became the occasion for sorrowful astonishment, for an outcry of pity, for execration against a war so cruel. Nevertheless it did not prevent the soldiers from putting as much ardor as before into massacring and robbing their relations, their connections by marriage, their brothers. They say to them-

² *Histoires*, edited and translated by H. Goelzer, Vol. I, p. 168. My translation is from Goelzer's text, with assistance from his French version of the passage.

selves: 'That which has been committed is a crime'; and in their turn they commit it.

This anecdote of the Roman historian is, I believe, not directly a source of the scene in *Nero*,³ but it is perhaps responsible for the development of the bare hint in Hall's *Chronicle*, which has been suggested by H. C. Hart⁴ as the source of the passage in *Henry VI, Part III*. Hall thus writes:

This conflict was in maner vnnatural, for in it the sonne fought against the father, the brother against the brother, the nephew against the vncler and the tenaunt against his lord.⁵

It should be noted that we have, in a scene doubtfully Shakespearian, the slaying of father by son, the recognition of the victim as the young man is robbing him, and his retirement, after he has mourned the deed, to bury the body. For the purpose of heightening the pathos, the author has introduced a father who has slain his son. This is simply a trick, however, a heaping of the pathetic upon the pathetic by the employment of simple addition, and has no special significance, as far as the source is concerned, though there is a hint in Tacitus' account of the civil war in Italy which may have been developed.

The University of North Dakota.

ROBERT S. FORSYTHE.

SOME LITERARY ECHOES

1. John Webster

In Webster's *Duchess of Malfi*, IV, 2, occur the following often quoted lines:

Glories, like glowworms, afar off shine bright,
But, looked to near, have neither heat nor light.

In *The Scourge of Folly* by John Davies of Hereford (1611), written several years before Webster's play, the 5th Epigram begins:

³ Tacitus' story has not been mentioned by Professor W. P. Mustard in his interesting "Notes on *The Tragedy of Nero*," *Philological Quarterly*, I, 173-78; neither has it been referred to by F. Ernst Schmid in *Die Tragödie "Nero" und Thomas May*, in *Materialien*, xli. In fact, Schmid calls the incident in *Nero* "eine Zutat des Dichters" (p. 167), which it literally is. On the other hand, it is probably derived from Tacitus through *Henry VI*.

⁴ In his edition of *Henry VI, Part III*, "Arden Shakespeare," p. 65, note.

⁵ Quoted by Hart, *ibid*.

Delia still paints; so Nature hurts with Art,
 And form with fashion utterly doth spill;
 She (glowworm like) doth shine, if put apart,
 But near at hand, she looks as black, as ill.

The reference to glowworms seems to have been more or less proverbial,¹ but as Bosola was speaking of the Duchess's fading beauty, Webster may have intended an allusion to Davies' satire.

2. Wordsworth

In his well-known sonnet "On the Extinction of the Venetian Republic" Wordsworth says of Venice:

She was a maiden City, bright and free;
 No guile seduced, no force could violate.

Very probably this natural and noble metaphor came spontaneously out of Wordsworth's brain. But it may possibly have been suggested to him by Coryat's *Crudities*, a well-known book of the seventeenth century, which had been republished when Wordsworth was a boy. In Vol. II, p. 58, of the 1776 edition Coryat says of Venice:

It is a matter very worthy the consideration, to think how this noble city hath like a pure virgin and incontaminated maid . . . kept her virginity untouched these thousand two hundred and twelve years . . . though emperors, kings, princes, and mighty potentates, being allured with her glorious beauty, have attempted to deflower her, every one receiving the repulse.

3. Hartley Coleridge

In Hartley Coleridge's poem *Album Verses* is the couplet:

I own I like to see my works in print;
 The page looks knowing, though there's nothing in't.

This is probably an echo from Byron's *English Bards and Scotch Reviewers*, which had first become popular when Hartley Coleridge was a boy. In that poem are two lines that run:

'Tis pleasant, sure, to see one's name in print;
 A book's a book, although there's nothing in't.

Yale University.

FREDERICK E. PIERCE

¹ See, for example, William Browne's *Britannia's Pastorals*, III, i, 204-207:

"A man, near frozen with December's ire,
 Hath, from a heap of glowworms, as much ease
 As I can ever have by dreams as these."

A NEW SCENE IN COLLEY CIBBER'S *RICHARD III*

That Cibber rewrote his *Tragical History of King Richard III* is a point which has seemingly escaped recognition. From iv, 2, of the melodrama, as it appears in the collected *Plays* of 1721, we learn that Tirrel has been bribed by Richard, who will give him "farther orders" in his closet. The next scene is in the Tower. Tirrel sends in Dighton and Forest to murder the princes. Richard reappears, anxiously awaiting the event. Perhaps there is a scream within, for he cries: "Hark, the Murder's doing"; and a moment later enter Tirrel to assure him that 'the brats were disposed of.'

Francis Gentleman in his *Dramatic Censor* (1770) found the King's soliloquy admirable, but "the scene between Tirrel, Dighton and Forest, should for two reasons have been made longer; first, to have raised our pity more, even by the immediate murderers; next, to have given Richard more time for his appearance at the Tower."¹ The abruptness at this point is, in fact, a direct result of Cibber's revision. For in the first edition of the play (1700) there is a new scene following the departure of Tirrel, Dighton, and Forest—a scene sufficiently curious to deserve quotation.²

SCENE: a Chamber, the Princes in Bed. The Stage darkned.

Pr. Ed. Why do you startle, Brother?

D. York. O! I have been so frighten in my sleep!

Pray turn this way.

Pr. Ed. Alas, I fain wou'd sleep, but cannot

Tho' 'tis the stillest night I ever knew.

¹ P. 3.

² Dr. Hazleton Spencer describes it briefly in his unpublished *Restoration Stage Versions of Shakespeare's Plays*, Harvard dissertation, 1923, p. 594, but had not consulted the later editions; while only the later editions were used for Genest's *Account of the English Stage*, II, 306, Richard Dohse's *Colley Cibber's Bühnenbearbeitung von Shakespeare's Richard III*, Bonn, 1897, pp. 7, 24, Frederick Kilborne's *Alterations and Adaptations of Shakespeare*, Boston, 1906, the *Furness Variorum*, pp. 603, 604, Miss A. I. P. Perry's *Stage History of Richard the Third*, 1909, pp. 85, 173, De Witt C. Croissant's *Studies in the Work of Colley Cibber*, Lawrence, Mass., 1912, pp. 6, 7, 64, and, seemingly, for G. C. D. Odell's *Shakespeare from Betterton to Irving*, 1920, pp. 75, 76.

Not the least breath has stir'd these four hours
Sure all the World's asleep but we.

D. York. Hark! Pray Brother count the Clock! (*Clock strikes.*
—But two! O tedious night: I've slept an Age.
Wou'd it were day, I am so melancholy.

Pr. Ed. Hark! What noise is that?
I thought I heard some one upon the stairs!
Hark! Again!

D. York. O dear, I hear 'em too! Who is it, Brother?

Pr. Ed. Bless me! a light too thro' the door! look there!

D. York. Who is it? Hark! it unlocks! O! I am so afraid!

Enter Dighton and Forrest with dark lanthorns.

Pr. Ed. Bless me! What frightful men are these?

Both. Who's there?

Pr. Ed. Who's there?

Digh. Hist, we've wak'd 'em! What shall we say?

For. Nothing. We come to do.

Dich. I'll see their Faces—

D. York. Won't they speak to us?

(*Dighton looks in with his Lanthorn.*)

O save me! Hide me! Save me, Brother!

Pr. Ed. O mercy Heaven! Who are you, Sirs,
That look so ghastly pale and terrible?

Digh. I am a Fool.—I cannot answer 'em.

For. You must die, my Lord, so must your Brother.

Pr. Ed. O stay, for pity sake! What is our Crime, Sir?
Why must we die?

Digh. The King, your Uncle, loves you not.

Pr. Ed. O Cruel man!

Tell him we'll live in Prison all our days,
And, when we give occasion of offense,
Then let us die: H'as yet no cause to kill us.

For. Pray.

Pr. Ed. We do, Sir, to you. O spare us Gentlemen!
I was some time your King, and might have shown
You mercy: For your dear Souls sake pity us.

For. We'll hear no more.

Both. Pr. O Mercy, Mercy! { *They smother them, and*

For. Down, down with 'em. { *the Scene shuts on them.*

Then enter Tirrel, followed a moment later by Richard; and
the rest of the act proceeds as in the later editions.³

³ There are minor variations throughout. Thus, where the edition of 1721 has: "Scene draws, and discovers Lady Anne in Mourning, Lord

I am still at a loss to fix the exact date when Cibber recast the act. Mr. Walter Powell of the Birmingham Public Libraries has assured me that their copy of the second edition, as listed by Jagard,⁴ a 12mo. printed in 1718, does not contain the scene given above, but falls into line with the subsequent editions of 1721, 1734, etc. And this reduces the interval a little. I have made a cursory examination of the unfortunately incomplete file of *The Daily Courant* at Yale for some advertisement which might reduce it still further, and have had the performances recorded by Mr. Nicoll⁵ looked up in the Latreille ms. at the British Museum, but without success.

Why so effective a piece of gruesomeness should have been rescinded is a matter for conjecture. Cibber tells us, himself, that owing to the objections of the Master of the Revels the actors "were forc'd, for some few Years, to let the Play take its Fate with only four Acts divided into five,"⁶ the whole of the first act being omitted. Perhaps, when it was restored⁷ some reduction was felt to be necessary elsewhere, and the scene of the princes' murder went by the board. Perhaps the audience rebelled—the *première* was admittedly a failure⁸—but Mr. Spectator's description of the vogue of the horrible, a few years later, makes this conjecture seem unlikely.⁹ At any rate, we may be sure that Aristotelian injunctions against visible violence did not prompt

Stanley, Tressel, Guards and Bearers, with *King Henry's Body*" (II, 2, p. 89) that of 1700 has: "*Enter Bearers with King Henry's Body, the Lady Ann in Mourning, Lord Stanley, Tressel, and Guards, who all advance from the middle Isle (sic) of the Church*" (p. 12).

⁴ *Shakespeare Bibliography*, p. 51.

⁵ *History of Early Eighteenth Century Drama*, p. 307.

⁶ *Apology*, ed. R. W. Lowe, I, 276.

⁷ Penkethman's "Medley," October 12, 1702, included "The Death of King Henry VI," with Cibber as Richard (Genest, II, 255). The play was revived April 4, 1704, as "not acted these three years" (Mr. Nicoll overlooked this performance, which is chronicled in *The Daily Courant*, and by Genest, II, 300) but there is no hint of innovations. On March 27, 1710, the part of King Henry was acted by Wilks (Genest, II, 449).

⁸ Cibber did not get five pounds from his third day ("To the Reader," prefixed to *Ximena*, 1719).

⁹ No. XLIV.

the change. For was not poor Henry brought on the stage only to be butchered there?¹⁰

ARTHUR COLBY SPRAGUE.

Harvard University.

"AMELIA, OR THE DISTRESSED WIFE"

In the monthly booklist of the *Gentleman's Magazine* for May, 1751, under the heading "Poetry and Entertainment," there appeared this item: "Amelia, or the distressed wife. 5s. sewed. T. Osborne, Dodsley, Dod, Baldwin, Willock." A copy of this book is now in the British Museum. As Fielding's *Amelia* was published only six months later,¹ a brief account of this earlier *Amelia* may be of some slight interest, and may serve to answer any conjectures about indebtedness.

The title-page of the British Museum copy reads: "Amelia, or, The Distress'd Wife: A History Founded on Real Circumstances. By a Private Gentlewoman. London: Printed for the Authoress, 1751." The book was thus characterized in the *Monthly Review* for June, 1751 (pp. 71-2):

As this is a piece of secret personal history, to which we have no key, we shall take no further notice of it, except that it is printed by a subscription, which seems to have been merely a charitable one, for the benefit of the writer, a woman, who gives her own history under the name of *Amelia*.

It is apparent that the reviewer did not consider the book to be fiction at all, in spite of its being listed under "Poetry and Entertainment" in the *Gentleman's Magazine*.

The narrative opens with the story of Amelia's wooing by a Mr. Johnson. After a romantic courtship, they were married, and "Amelia's Study now is, how to make a good and engaging wife" (p. 18). But she soon discovered that her husband possessed a

¹⁰ Richard's death-scene might also be adduced—but the whole play is gory.

¹ On December 18, 1751, according to W. L. Cross, *The History of Henry Fielding*, II, 304.

secret vice, a passion for old books, which became so inordinate that he could find no money for her needs, although he could always purchase a rare first edition. She had to separate from her husband, and lived on an annuity which he granted, but which was often in arrears. After many reverses of fortune, she wrote this book, hoping that the publicity would make it unnecessary to seek legal aid in collecting what was due her. According to her own account, she remained loving, dutiful, and forgiving throughout, her sweet docility at times enraging her own people.

It will be readily apparent that Fielding could find very little to his purpose in "Amelia, or the distressed wife." True, his Amelia frequently appears in moods more amiable than gay, and Booth's secret faults threaten to wreck the marriage more than once, but here resemblance ceases. The similarity of the names of the heroines can hardly be intentional, since the two books are not related as *Pamela* and *Joseph Andrews* are.

The book is badly written, and would be unintelligible at times but for a list of "Names mentioned in this Work," which serves as a *dramatis personae*. The writer admits in the preface a "Want of Ability," but continued because reassuring friends said that "*Truth . . . wanted not Ornament; and Nature and Simplicity* were all that were required." Readers are asked to suspend judgment until finishing "the whole Artless Story; and then, I flatter myself, that the Calamities and Injuries of *Amelia* will have raised in their Bosoms so much generous Pity, as will make them pass over all Imperfections."

The question occurs, are books like this fiction or biography? Its first reviewer called it "a piece of secret personal history." An investigation might show that such "secret histories" frequently handled fact with the same freedom that the writers of the criminal biographies used.

ROGER P. McCUTCHEON.

Tulane University.

A NOTE ON THE VERSIFICATION OF *CHILDE HAROLD*

A count of the run-on lines and stanzas of *Childe Harold* gives the following table:¹

	Percentage of times each line is run on:								Average no. of run-on lines per stanza	Average no. of run-on stanzas
	Line 1	Line 2	Line 3	Line 4	Line 5	Line 6	Line 7	Line 8		
² Canto I....	24	5	13	7	29	16	21	13	1 1/5	1 in 41
³ Canto II...	32	7	13	9	29	13	18	12	1 1/4	1 in 38
Canto III...	33	41	41	30	42	48	44	33	3 1/9	1 in 39
Canto IV...	41	43	44	41	54	48	47	45	3 2/3	1 in 5

From this simple chart several rather interesting conclusions may be drawn.

1. The metrical construction in the first two cantos is very rigid, the stanzas are self-contained, there is normally a sharp break after the fourth line, and, most important, *Byron is really writing in couplets*. The thought is usually expressed in two lines, and the even lines are, therefore, comparatively end-stopped.

2. The second canto shows a slightly greater metrical freedom than the first.

3. The third canto has lost the rigidity of the first two, and the *bondage to the couplet is broken*.

4. The fourth canto shows a further advance in run-on lines within each stanza, and besides, *an abrupt and complete emancipation from the closed stanza*. This emancipation may be due to

¹ The text used is that in E. H. Coleridge's edition of *Byron's Poetry*, Vol. II, 1899. The test of run-on lines and stanzas is the simple one of punctuation: run-on lines are those which have no mark of punctuation at the end, run-on stanzas, those which are not ended with an exclamation point, a question mark, or a period.

² In the first canto I have not counted those stanzas which were added in 1812 or 1814, since they represent an intermediate stage of development. They are the stanzas To Ianthe, and stanzas 1, 8, 9, 43, 85, 86, 88-92.

³ As in the first canto the additions of 1812 and 1814 are omitted, viz: stanzas (numbered as they are in E. H. Coleridge's edition) 8, 9, 15, 27, 53, 64, 77-83, 88-90, 93-98.

Byron's growing familiarity with Pulci's and Ariosto's ottava rima, but, whatever its inspiration, it indicates an amazing facility and technique in versification.

HAROLD STEIN.

Yale University.

THOMAS MIDDLETON'S *THE VIPER'S BROOD*

The subjoined, hitherto unpublished, suit was brought in Trinity Term, 1609, by Robert Keysar against Thomas Middleton. The plaintiff alleges that the defendant was indebted to him for £16; that on May 6, 1606, he entered into an obligation to pay £8-10-0 before June 15 following; but that he failed to keep the conditions of his bond. The defendant Middleton, however, declared that the conditions had been fulfilled, in that on May 7, the next day after the signing of the obligation, he had delivered to Keysar, in full satisfaction of the bond, a certain tragedy called "The Viper and Her Brood," which had been accepted as payment by the plaintiff. These few facts are all that the legal summary contains, and I have no information as to the further success of this suit.

Slight as these facts are, they are not without interest. To be able to add another title to Middleton's plays, even though the play itself is lost, is something, just as it is something to know that as early as 1606 he had written a tragedy. Then too, the suit tells us a little more about the movements of that very interesting man Robert Keysar.

Keysar, a goldsmith and probably well to do, came into the management of the Revels children at Blackfriars in 1605 or early in 1606. Mr. J. Q. Adams thinks it was in 1605, after the troubles over *Eastward Ho* and the consequent flight of John Marston.¹ We know that Marston sold his share to Keysar, but not the precise date. Mr. Chambers holds for the early months of 1606, when the troubles over the *Isle of Gulls* had resulted in a reorganization of the company,² and this seems to me rather more likely, inasmuch as we hear nothing of Keysar's connection with the Revels

¹ *Shakespearean Playhouses*, 1917, p. 218.

² *The Elizabethan Stage*, 1923, II, p. 52.

company before 1606. Up to this time Middleton had devoted himself to the children of Paul's, for whom he had written *Blurt*, *Master Constable*, *The Phoenix*, *A Trick to Catch the Old One*, *A Mad World, my Masters*, *Michaelmas Term*, *The Puritan* (?), and perhaps the *Family of Love*. The earliest of these plays date 1601-2 and the latest 1606. He then wrote at least one of his extant plays for the Revels children (the old Chapel Royal company), *Your Five Gallants* (1607), and at least one of the Paul's plays (*A Trick to Catch*) passed over into the Revels repertory. Now 1606 seems to be the year in which the Paul's boys ceased playing; their last recorded performance was on July 30, when they gave *The Chances* before the King of Denmark, and they are not heard of as an active body after that. One might, therefore, suppose that on their cessation Middleton carried his wares to the rival company. But the Paul's company was still alive in July, whereas the present suit tells us that Middleton was delivering plays to Keysar in May. There is every reason to think that Middleton was dealing with Keysar not as a money broker but as a theatrical manager, and that the debt he incurred was in earnest of a play. It looks as though the star playwright of Paul's were deserting his old friends and taking on with new.

Undoubtedly something happened to Paul's before the close of 1606, else they would not have shut down in the face of a signal honor at court. Were they insidiously undermined by the new manager of the Revels boys. Or was there a gentlemanly agreement that Pierce was to stop playing, for a consideration? We know that in 1608 he was being paid £20 a year to lie still, and that the initiator of his purchase was Keysar. The key of the mystery seems to be in Keysar's hands; we are given the merest glimpse of it in the present suit. For my part, I am quite willing to believe that he was at the bottom of the closing of Paul's. At any rate, he is an intriguing figure, about whom we ought to know more.

One other fact about Keysar is puzzling. On February 20, 1606, he and Edward Kirkham were paid for supplying the Westminster boys with apparel for a play, date unknown but recent. Whence came this apparel? From Blackfriars, presumably, supposing that Keysar was by this time a member of the governing board. But we have reason to think that Kirkham was no longer connected with that company, having gone over to Paul's in 1605 and taken

some of the Revels plays with him. What is the meaning of this association?

From these questions, which I raise in the hope that someone can answer them, I pass to the text of the Keysar-Middleton suit.

Coram Rege Rolls, Trinity Pt. II, A° 7 Jas. I. Memb. 1056b.

Memorandum quod alias scilicet Termino Pasche ultimo preterito coram domino Rege apud Westmonasterium venit Robertus keysar per Edwardum Pye Attornatum suum Et protulit hic in Curia dicti domini Regis tunc ibidem quandam billam suam versus Thomam Middleton de Newington Butts in Comite Surrey generosum in Custodia Marrescalli & de placito debiti Et sunt plegii de proseguendo scilicet Johannes Doo & Ricardus Roo Que quidem billa sequitur in hec verba // london// Robertus keysar queritur de Thome Middleton de Newington Buttes in Comite Surrey generoso in Custodia Marrescalli Marescalesie domini Regis coram ipso Rege existente de placito quod reddet ei sexdecim libras legalis monete Anglie quas ei debet & iniuste detinet pro eo videlicet quod cum predictus Thomas sexto die Maij Anno regni domini Jacobi nunc Regis Anglie quarto apud london videlicet in parochia beate Marie de Arcubus in warda de Cheap london per quoddam scriptum suum Obligatorium Sigillo ipsius Thome sigillatum Curieque dicti domini Regis nunc hic ostensum Cuiusque datum est eisdem die & Anno Cognoscit se teneri & firmiter Obligari prefato Roberto in predictis sexdecim libris Soluendis eidem Roberto cum inde requisitus esset predictus tamen Thomas licet sepius requisitus & predictas sexdecim libras prefato Roberto nondum soluit sed illas ei hucusque soluere omnino Contradixit & adhuc Contradicit ad dampnum ipsius Roberti quinque librarum Et inde producit sectam &c.

Et modo ad hunc diem scilicet diem veneris proximum post Crastinum sancte Trinitatis isto eodem Termino vsque quem diem predictus Thomas Middleton habuit licenciam ad billam predictam interloquendum & tunc ad respondendum &c Coram domino Rege apud Westmonasterium venerunt tam predictus Robertus keysar per Attornatum suum predictum quam predictus Thomas Middleton per Michaellem Moseley Attornatum suum. Et idem Thomas defendit vim & iniuriam quando &c Et petit auditum scripti Obligatorij predicti Et ei legitur &c petit eciam auditum Condicionis eiusdem scripti. Et ei legitur in hec verba // The Condicion of this Obligacion is such That yf the within bounden Thomas Middleton his executors or Assignes do well and trulie paye or cause to be paid vnto the within named Robert keysar his executors or Assignes Att or in the nowe Shopp of the said Robert in Cheapeside in london The some of Eight powndes & tenn shillinges of lawfull money of England On the fifteenth daye of June next ensuing the date hereof That then this Obligacion to be void Or ells yt to stand in full force & vertue. Quibus lectis & auditis idem Thomas Middleton dicit quod predictus Robertus keysar accionem suam predictam inde versus eum habere

seu mauntenere non debet quia dicit quod post confessionem scripti Obligatorij predicti Et ante predictum decimum quintum diem Junij in Condicione predicta mencionatum scilicet septimo die Maij Anno regni dicti domini Regis nunc quarto supradicto predictus Thomas Middleton apud domum mancionalem cuiusdem Willelmi Bannyster scituatam & existentem in Warwicke Courte in parochia Ecclesie Christi in warda de farringdon infra london deliberavit prefato Roberto keysar quendam librum lusorium tragicum vocatum the vyper & her broode in plenam satisfaccionem contentacionem & exoneracionem predictarum Octo librarum & decem solidorum in Condicione predicta superius specificatarum quem quidem librum predictus Robertus keysar adtunc & ibidem de eodem Thoma Middleton recepit & acceptavit Et hoc paratus est verificare vnde petit indicium si predictus Robertus keysar accionem suam predictam versus eum habere seu mauntenere debeat &c.

Et predictus Robertus keysar dicit quod ipse per aliqua per predictum Thomam Middleton superius placitando allegata ab accione sua predicta versus ipsum Thomam Middleton habenda percludi non debet quia dicit quod idem Thomas Middleton non deliberavit prefato Roberto keysar predictum librum lusorium tragicum in plenam satisfaccionem & exoneracionem predictarum Octo librarum & decem solidorum in Condicione predicta superius specificatarum modo & forma prout predictus Thomas Middleton superius placitando allegavit Et hoc petit quod inquiratur per patriam Et predictus Thomas Middleton similiter &c Ideo venire inde Juratur coram domino Rege apud Westmonasterium die veneris proximo post Octabas sancti hillarij Et qui nec &c ad recognoscendum &c qui tam &c Idem dies datus est partibus predictis ibidem &c.

University of Illinois.

HAROLD N. HILLEBRAND.

GERMAN TRESPE

As far as I am aware no satisfactory etymology of this word has ever been given. To be sure, Kluge in his *Wörterbuch* connects it with Dutch *drep*, a dialectic form, and Middle English *drawk* and these in turn with *Treff* found in several modern German dialects. Apart from semantic considerations, it is at once apparent that this derivation will not hold water. The *s* is altogether unaccounted for. Under these circumstances it is perhaps permissible to suggest another source.

As is well known, many plants (flowers, weeds and vegetables) are loan words from Latin. Cf. English *vetch* < *vicia*; Germ. *Lolch* < *lolum*, *Raps* < *rapicium*, *Kerbel* < *caerefolium*, etc. These loan words often undergo all sorts of mutilation by apheresis, apo-

cope, syncope, metathesis and otherwise. Cf. Latin *cucurbita* > Germ. *Kürbis*, *narcissus* > *Zisse* (Ostfriesland), *labrusca* > *Proza*, *serpyllum* > *Huhner-serb*, *portulaca* > *Burtzel*, etc. In a similar way the Greek (via Latin of course) word *tetrasperma* has been treated: *te* | *traspe* | *rma*. The original *a* of *tetra* is perhaps still found in such dialect forms as *draspe*, *trasp*, *traspen*. Forms like *trefs*, *trefzen* are also met with, but in these we have simply a metathesis of the consonants (cf. *kinster* for *knister* < *genista*). It is very likely that the mutation of *p* to *f* as well as of *t* to *d* was simultaneous with the reception of the word into those dialects that had already shifted original *p* to *f* or in which *d* was the only dental, a process similar in many respects to the Low German back-shift in such words as *Krettelkrut* for *Krässelkraut* < *crassula*, *Zittelröschen* for *Zissel* < (*Nar*)*cissus* + *el* (cf. *Toffel* from [*Chris*]toph + *el*) etc.

The botanical names for *Trespe* are *bromus secalinus*, *lolium temulentum* (Taumelloch) and *zizania*. It was thought that the seeds of this weed produced a sort of intoxication or narcosis; hence the name *lolium temulentum*. It is interesting to note in this connection that the word *durth* found in the Old Saxon *Heliand* and still current in modern German dialects had probably the same meaning, if Jacob Grimm has rightly connected it with Greek *θύραπος* = *lolium* (Schwindelhafer). The Greek *αἶπα* "a weed in wheat, darnel" was also a narcotic plant.

In conclusion I wish to call attention to the fact that English *tare(s)* first known about 1330 is glossed with *tetrasperma* (cf. *New Engl. Dictionary*, ix, 92). Kluge connects it with Lithuanian *dirva*, "wheatfield." Might it not also be derived from *tetra(sperma)*?

George Washington University.

EDWARD H. SEHRT.

¹ Cf. Pritzel u. Jessen, *Die deutschen Volksnamen der Pflanzen*, p. 243.

² *Ibid.*, p. 443.

³ *Ibid.*, p. 401.

⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 303.

⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 68 and Nemnich, *Allgemeines Polyglotten-Lexicon der Naturgeschichte*, II, 436.

⁶ Pritzel u. Jessen, p. 219.

⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 442 and Kluge, *Wörterbuch*, s. v. *Ginster*.

⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 371.

REVIEWS.

Orígenes del Español. Estado lingüístico de la península ibérica hasta el siglo XI (*Revista de Filología*, Anejo I). Por R. MENÉNDEZ PIDAL. Madrid: Casa Editorial Hernando, 1926, 8vo., xii + 580 pp.

For the preliterate period of the Spanish language we have a dearth of reliable source-material. The *Poema del Cid* and the *Auto de los Reyes Magos* have been not only the basis of our studies of twelfth-century Spanish, but also the basis for reconstructing the language of the previous centuries. The spanning of the period between the seventh and twelfth centuries has been largely theoretical. Our best results in the way of phonetic laws have left many gaps and many uncertainties in regard to chronology and geographical distribution of the elements of the language during this preliterate period.

Those Latin documents of the twelfth century that deal with the daily life of the people consist largely of cartularies, city charters, and royal grants, written in the scholastic Latin of the period. These documents throw little light on the actual speech of the contracting parties, except in those cases where the scribe or notary vacillates between the use of the specific Romance and the specific Latin form of a word, as in *otro* versus *alterum*. In Latin notarial documents of the end of the eleventh century there is even less colloquial material, and interesting Romance variants are practically non-existent. This condition is explained by Menéndez Pidal as due to the influence of the Order of Cluny, which had control of the Spanish Church at that time, and was instrumental in insisting on a pure scholastic Latin.

If we look now at the notarial and monastic-Latin documents of the ninth, tenth and eleventh centuries (to 1078) published and studied in the book under review, we find a totally different state of affairs. This Latin was largely an outgrowth of the Vulgar Latin of the earlier centuries, and contains not only archaisms from the earlier Latin, but also new words and forms of the vulgar, or Romance, speech. Here the scribe did not vacillate merely between Latin *alterum* and Romance *otro*, but also between Romance *autro*, *outro*, and *otro*. Similarly, we find him using for *Domini-cum* the Romance variants *Dominigo*, *Domingo*, *Domengo*. We know through him that the preterit *levantot*, *levantod*, existed at one time side by side with *levantait*, *levantaut*, *levantaot*, that *trídico* and *trídigo* were current variants, for modern 'trigo.' In other words, this preliterate Spanish of the ninth, tenth and

eleventh centuries shows a vacillation in usage that is foreign to the literary language, and contains documented forms of speech in place of the forms reconstructed by the modern philologists.

A second group of material found in these earliest Latin documents is that due to false erudition or "ultracorrección" on the part of the notary; thus, *deforamar* for *deformar*, *conticuos* for *contiguos*, *púplica* for *pública*, *fuerma* for *forma*, and even *Kórtoba* for *Córdoba*. Not only in phonology and morphology do the preliterate documents contain Romance forms that disappeared before the literary period, but the same is true of lexicography, and we find the reinforced demonstrative *eleiso* < *ille* **picsu*; the indefinite pronouns *qualbis* < *qualevis*, *quiscatique* 'cadaquisque,' *niquenti* 'ninguno'; the preposition *yestra* < *extra*; the adverbs *algondre* < *aliundre*, *alquieras* < *alid quaeras* (p. 569).

From the preceding discussion it is hoped that the reader may have some idea of the purpose of the *Orígenes del Español*; namely, a history of the Spanish language of the ninth, tenth, and eleventh centuries, based on material actually found in the contemporary documents. In view of the fact that certain phases of that language show contemporary archaisms and false erudition, we gain a glimpse, at least, into a still earlier period that embraces the seventh and eighth centuries. Indeed, in presenting and studying this vast new field, Menéndez Pidal has made a monumental contribution of facts and conclusions, and has opened up stages of language-evolution that were entirely unknown to us.

This brings us then to the method of the book. The material is divided into four parts: *Textos*, *Gramática*, *Regiones y Épocas*, and *Conclusiones*. The first part, *Textos*, contains the texts of the tenth-century *Glosas Emelienses* and *Glosas Silenses*. Then follow four documents from León, one each from Monzón, Liébana, and Carrión, and two from Aragón; these documents range in date from 980 to 1078. It is needless to add that all are edited with the most scrupulous care and exactitude. The linguistic sources are not confined, however, to the texts here published, since in the subsequent portions of his book the author has drawn vast stores from printed texts of medieval documents, from collections of monastic manuscripts, and from the archives of Spain, especially the Archivo Histórico Nacional. In the matter of critical source-material special mention should be made of that pertaining to the Arabic and Mozarabic languages.

Part II treats *Gramática* under the subheads of orthography, phonology, morphology, syntax, and lexicography. To analyze this section of nearly 400 pages is, of course, impossible. In spite of the mass of material recorded and studied by the author, the presentation is clear and logical; there are numerous linguistic maps, and in many chapters a paragraph of summary is included.

The basic fact in the whole question of orthography is the insufficiency of the Latin alphabet for transcribing those sounds that were foreign to Classic Latin. Consequently, the scribe or notary had no symbols at hand for writing such consonants as *ñ, l, ch, z, s, š, ž*, nor such diphthongs as *ou, ue, ie*. The present reviewer has called attention to this in his review of Menéndez Pidal's *Documentos Lingüísticos*.¹ In illustration from the texts before us, for the single consonant *y* we find *g, ig* and *gi* (*magore, arigenzos, Frogilani*); for *ñ* we find *ni, in, inn, nni, ng, gn, nn*; for *l* we find *li, il, ill, lg, gl, ll, l*. But, as Menéndez Pidal remarks, this orthography is not so irregular as at first sight it seems, and contains in itself all the elements that produced the admirable phonetic orthography of the twelfth and thirteenth centuries. His conclusions on this point seem beyond challenge (p. 77):

La ortografía, pues, en que se publicaron las obras de la gran literatura de los tiempos de San Fernando y de Alfonso el Sabio, no fué invención de los que escribieron esos que figuran entre los códices más antiguos conservados de la literatura castellana, sino que es fruto de large práctica, de lenta selección, ejercitada en los siglos que precedieron al XII; la ortografía alfonsí procede por tradición interrumpida de la grafía usual en los siglos X y XI.

As an illustration of the treatment of phonology the material on Latin *ai* > *e* is typical. It occupies 25 pages, and may be divided into groups represented by the following words: 1) *vaiga*, 'vega'; 2) *caseum* > *kaiso*, 'queso'; 3) *carraria* > *caraira*, 'carrera'; 4) *ferraginem* > *ferraine*, 'herrén'; 5) *vigila* > *veila*, 'vela'; 6) *pactare* > *pait'ar*, 'pechar,' *lectum* > *leit'o*, 'lecho.' The examples of *ai* came into the language at different times and in diverse districts; they became *ei* under similarly varying conditions and eventually became *e*, though at different periods. In other words, certain districts were more conservative than others; Galicia-Portugal never developed beyond the *ei*-stage, while Castilla, Aragón, and León show varying stages of conservatism. The last-mentioned district, at a time when *ei* had become *e*, shows a preference for the archaism *ai* rather than for *ei*.

For *o* we find the main stages *uo, ue, ua*, the last-mentioned being especially characteristic of León and Aragón. Menéndez Pidal's evidence that in the *uo*-stage the stress fell on the last vowel (*uó*) seems to be conclusive. But he goes one step further in regard to the scribal *ue* of the *Poema del Cid*, and is inclined to believe that in rhyme and assonance with *o* it represented simple *o* instead of the diphthong *uo*. This belief is based on the abundant use of *o* in notarial documents as late as the middle of the thirteenth century.

¹ Cf. *Mod. Lang. Notes*, XXXVIII (1923), 226-227.

From the standpoint of lexicography, dialect history is beautifully illustrated by the treatment of the word-groups *prunum-nixum-cereolum*, *parire-fetare*, *cottum-collis-podium-altarium-cirrum*, and by the various names for 'mustela' (pp. 410-433). The last two groups are further illustrated by maps in color. Somewhat similar is the chronological and geographical history of *medietatem*, through the stages that finally resulted in *meatad*, *meetad*, *meitad*, *mitad*, *metad* (pp. 272-278). As a further illustration the etymology of *bravo* is definitely settled as *pravus*, 'fiero, salvage, inculto,' as applied to both land and animals, since the voiced initial in *bravo*, *bravum*, is found as early as 1030, and side by side with *pravus*. In somewhat lighter vein is the fact that while the double title *domnus domnus* is practically unknown for men, the feminine *domna domna* (domna donna Sancia) seems to be "un uso propio principalmente para halagar la vanidad feminina" (p. 335).

Throughout Part II, *Gramática*, the material under each phenomenon is classified primarily on geographical lines, accompanied by numerous linguistic maps, with the chronology following as a sub-classification. In Part III, *Regiones y Épocas*, this material is readjusted and amplified to form a consecutive narrative history. The four main geographical divisions are Mozarabic Spain, Asturias and León, Navarra and Aragón, Castilla. The treatment of the Mozarabs is especially illuminating. Throughout their existence they retained their Spanish or Spanish-Latin speech, although with distinctly local or dialect divisions as evidenced by the Arabic glosses. The various sub-dialects are localized and characterized from a linguistic point of view and from their influence on the purely Christian dialects. The mere citation of certain chapter headings will give a fair idea of the treatment of the *Épocas*: "Época visigoda 414-711," "Epoca asturiano-mozárabe 711-920," "Hegemonía leonesa desde 920 hasta 1067," "Lucha por la hegemonía castellana 1067-1140."

The *Conclusiones*, which form Part IV, present in concrete narrative form the author's ideas and principles of historical grammar as revealed in the more detailed portions of the book. Indeed, this masterly final chapter may be regarded as the introductory chapter, and can be read with profit before entering upon the earlier chapters which furnish the more detailed items of fact and deduction.

Within the plan of the book as a whole there are many special studies that stand out for one reason or another. In selecting for mention a few from the large number, the reviewer is influenced by his own personal interests. Possibly the most striking hypothesis presented by Menéndez Pidal is that of an Osco-Umbrian dialect center in preliterate Spain. The triple phonetic phenomena

nb > *n*, *mb* > *m*, and the voicing of an occlusive mute when in contact with a voiced fricative (*algalde* for *alcalde*, *rangura* for *ran-cura*, *aldo* for *alto*) are a striking characteristic of the Osco-Umbrian dialect of Italy; the same triple phenomena are likewise found restricted to the region of Osca in Spain. Furthermore, Sertorius, born in the Oscan district of Italy, selected the Spanish city of Osca as the location of the schools for educating and Romanizing Spanish youths. Consequently, Menéndez Pidal posits the Italian etymon for Spanish *Osca*, and concludes that the above-mentioned group of linguistic traits show the transplanting and localizing of a specific Latin dialect of South Italy. The broader application of this logical conclusion touches the question of whether popular Latin showed dialect variations or whether the variations were simply chronological.

A second chapter that has a more than national import is the treatment of Latin *f*. Here the author presents the most extensive and best-arranged study that has appeared on the subject (pp. 219-240). He finds a probable example of *f* > *h* as early as 1057 (*hayuela* based on *fabea*), and an assured example in 1092 (*Ormaza* < *formacea*). From this date isolated examples are numerous in place- and person-names, and there is even one example of a common noun, *honsata* < *fonsatum*, in the year 1132. With the exception of the last, all examples are from the district of Castilla or Rioja, and the later examples of the thirteenth century tend to confirm this restricted geographical area. So it is evident that the passage of *f* to *h* is not a phenomenon that should be identified as a fourteenth- and fifteenth-century change, since we have evidence of it in preliterate Spanish. Menéndez Pidal believes that the early *f* was a labio-dental, not a bilabial, and that the change of *f* to *h* represents an "equivalencia acústica" and a "substitución repentina." The present reviewer hopes to offer in the near future additional material touching the above question.

A final item of more general interest is the hypothesis that in León we find side by side with the scholastic Latin and the colloquial speech,

Un tercer tipo, un latín vulgar, ese latín popular que no se solía escribir ya en otras partes y que en el reino asturoleonés fué mucho más usado, a juzgar por sus frecuentes manifestaciones, entre los notarios del reino durante los siglos X y XI (p. 478).

The convincing evidence of this is seen in the voicing of the mutes in the Latin of León, of which examples are found as early as 870 (*plaguit*, *artigulo*) and are abundant throughout the tenth and eleventh centuries. A great many of these Latin words did not pass into Spanish. This is in contrast to Castilla and Aragón, where the voicing of the mutes is found only in those words that have persisted in Spanish, such as *iglesia*, *agua*, etc. Further-

more, this Leonese Latin "a pesar de ser vulgar" retained various features of literary Latin morphology, especially the forms of the passive voice and the declension of nouns, which had disappeared from the normal Vulgar Latin.

In the foregoing study I have attempted to give some faint idea of the importance of a monumental work which contributes an entirely new chapter to the history of the Spanish language. Anything approaching an adequate idea of the book cannot be presented within the limits of a review, since each paragraph is worthy of individual treatment.

C. CARROLL MARDEN.

Princeton University.

Gatien de Courtilz, sieur du Verger, étude sur un précurseur du roman réaliste en France. By B. M. WOODBRIDGE. Baltimore, Johns Hopkins Press and Paris, Presses universitaires, 1925, in-8°. 214 pp. (The Johns Hopkins Studies in Romance Literatures and Languages, vol. VI.)

Voici, si je ne me trompe, le livre de début de M. Woodbridge dans l'histoire littéraire de la France. C'est un essai fort honorable, que MM. C. H. Grandgent et G. Lanson, à qui l'auteur l'a dédié, et M. Louis André, qui a pris la peine de le réviser, n'ont pas à regretter d'avoir encouragé. Frappé de ce qu'un auteur aussi fécond et par beaucoup de côtés aussi curieux, tant pour la littérature que pour l'histoire, n'avait pas encore sa monographie, M. W. s'est proposé de combler, en partie tout au moins, cette lacune. Il fallait pour cela d'abord composer une biographie aussi complète que possible, tâche difficile, car Courtilz, qui ne fut l'homme ni d'un seul livre ni d'un seul métier, n'écrivit guère qu'en cachette ses productions, qu'il faisait imprimer la plupart du temps à l'étranger, ensuite établir une liste complète de ses ouvrages, entreprise plus malaisée encore, car Courtilz, et pour cause, n'en a signé aucun. Il fallait enfin, non seulement lire ces ouvrages, si nombreux qu'ils forment une véritable bibliothèque, mais étudier avec soin tout au moins les principaux pour montrer les rapports qui les unissent les uns avec les autres, caractériser leur manière et les situer dans la littérature du temps.

De la première partie de sa tâche M. W. s'est acquitté avec succès. Sur la famille de C., sur sa vie, mal connue et pleine encore de mystère, il nous a donné à peu près tout ce qu'il est possible de savoir. Ce n'est pas sa faute si les archives de la guerre gardent le silence sur le côté militaire de la vie de son auteur. Au moins a-t-il fouillé avec soin les données du Cabinet

des titres de la Bibliothèque Nationale, ceux des Archives Nationales et des Archives de la Bastille.¹ Mais pourquoi n' a-t-il pas conservé à son auteur le nom de Courtilz de Sandras sous lequel il est généralement connu? Sandras était, à vrai dire, le nom de la mère de l'écrivain. Mais il était courant à cette époque d'ajouter le nom de la mère à celui du père. N'est-ce pas ainsi que Charles de Batz-Castelmore a pris le surnom d'Artagnan qui appartenait à sa famille maternelle et sous lequel il est passé à la postérité?

La deuxième partie du travail de M. W. nous paraît moins satisfaisante. Les recherches de l'auteur sur les ouvrages de C. auraient dû logiquement aboutir à l'établissement d'une liste critique à laquelle ou pût désormais se référer en toute confiance. C'était une besogne sinon facile, du moins nécessaire et, dans une certaine mesure, possible. D'une part en effet C. a une manière, un genre d'esprit, un style enfin bien à lui; d'un autre côté il fait souvent des allusions à tel ou tel de ses précédents ouvrages. Il y a enfin les témoignages des contemporains. M. W. a bien donné dans un appendice une liste des œuvres de C., mais il avoue lui-même qu'il a "mieux aimé ne pas trancher la question d'authenticité." C'est dire qu'il a reculé devant la deuxième partie, la plus importante peut-être, de la tâche qui s'offrait à lui et que, cette liste critique qu'on attendait des ouvrages de C., un autre que lui devra s'efforcer de l'établir un jour.

Venons à la troisième partie, qui est l'étude, en quelque sorte par le dedans, des œuvres du fécond publiciste. M. W. ne l'a pas esquivée, mais on pourrait souhaiter qu'il l'eût traitée différemment. Nous ne lui reprocherons pas de n'avoir pas cherché à faire un départ rigoureux entre les parties purement romanesques et les parties vraiment historiques. C'est là, de sa part, une lacune volontaire et nous reconnaissons sans peine que le sujet était particulièrement difficile pour un étranger. Mais pour caractériser le genre de C., pour marquer à la fois ce qu'il doit à ses devanciers et ce qu'il apporte de personnel et de nouveau dans notre littérature, peut-être aurait-il mieux valu employer une méthode un peu moins scolaire que celle qui consiste à donner successivement l'analyse de certains ouvrages jugés les plus importants. Rien de clair ne se dégage de la lecture un peu fastidieuse de ces notes de travail qui eussent gagné à être classées et développées dans une série de chapitres consacrés aux procédés de composition et de style de C. étudiés en eux-mêmes et par comparaison avec ses devanciers et ses successeurs dans le roman historique ou réaliste.

¹ Je ne sais pourtant s'il s'est préoccupé de savoir si des papiers sur C. ou sa famille ne se seraient pas conservés par hasard au château du Verger, qui existe encore non loin de Montargis et qui, par parenthèse, appartient sous l'Empire au peintre Girodet. Peut-être y aurait-il là une petite recherche à faire.

Quoi qu'il en soit, l'effort de M. W. est méritoire et fait bien augurer de ses travaux futurs. Voici, pour finir, quelques remarques de détail. A propos des *Mémoires de M. de Bordeaux*, M. W. sait-il qu'un manuscrit en deux volumes, in-4°, des *Mémoires de Pierre de Bordeaux, sieur de Sablonière, sous Louis XIII* se trouvait en 1762 chez un collectionneur connu, Bombarde de Beaulieu?² P. 175: "Deux frères, nommés Charles, ce serait étrange," écrit M. W. Il se peut qu'il ait raison dans le cas particulier, mais la présence dans une même famille française de deux et même de trois frères portant le même prénom est un fait bien connu des généalogistes. P. 131, rappelant un passage des *Mémoires de M. d'Artagnan*, où il est dit que M. de Besmaux, le gouverneur de la Bastille, avait épousé "une fille de Plurinel," M. W. note que C. a commis là "une petite erreur." L'écrivain s'est en effet trompé, mais son lapsus montre combien il était au fond bien informé, car Marguerite de Peyrolz, femme de Besmaux, était sinon la fille, du moins la petite-fille d'Antoine de Plurinel de la Baume, l'auteur du *Manège Royal*. P. 194-195, à propos de la *Guerre d'Espagne, de Bavière et de Flandre, ou Mémoires du marquis Dxxx*, qu'il classe à l'appendice IX parmi les ouvrages généralement attribués à C., M. W. aurait pu citer l'opinion d'un homme bien informé, M. de Boislisle: "Il ne faut pas connaître les œuvres innombrables de Sandras pour mettre à son compte des volumes qui ne rappellent en rien ni son faire, ni sa connaissance surprenante des faits et des gens de son temps."³

CH. SAMARAN.

Paris.

Dramatic Theory in Spain. Extracts from Literature before and during the Golden Age. Edited by H. J. CHAYTOR. Cambridge University Press, 1925. xvi + 63 pp.

"The purpose of this book is to bring within the reach of students of Spanish literature a number of pieces which are, for the most part, to be found only in rare or expensive editions not readily accessible to the average reader." There is every need for such a book. It will acquaint the average reader—and as such we may also consider the often hurried college-student—with something of the critical background of the Spanish *comedia*. Some of the texts provided are not really hard to reach, but even a reprint in the *Bulletin Hispanique* is not always easily accessible

² *Catalogue des MSS. de l'Arsenal*, VIII, 286.

³ "Les aventures du marquis de Langalerie," *Revue historique*, LXVI (1898), 7.

to a student, or to one of many students, and of some texts a reprint will be welcomed even by the teacher and the professional student of Spanish literature. The latter will find the book convenient for reference; it draws attention to a field of study perhaps unduly neglected and may lead to further investigation. The editor should therefore be congratulated on his initiative and the hope may be expressed that his little volume will be widely used, in America as well as in England.

However, a few remarks, some from the point of view of the 'average reader,' some suggested by the preferences of the 'specialist,' may neither be ungracious nor unwelcome. If the average reader has a fault to find, the most serious one is that the selection is rather one-sided. Disregarding Figueroa, one might ask whether a title similar to Morel-Fatio's *Les défenseurs de la Comedia* would not have been more truly descriptive. None of the standard-bearers of the neo-classical tradition, Alonso López, Cascales, González de Salas (the latter very inaccessible, indeed) are included, and I, for one, cannot feel satisfied with their summary dismissal on the ground that "there is not much to be got from them except Italian criticism more bluntly stated." Were it not for this one-sidedness, some criticism might have been included of earlier date than Torres Naharro, some paragraphs, for instance, from Juan de Mena or the Marquis of Santillana.

The difficulty, in an anthology of this kind, lies more in knowing what to omit in the way of commentary, than what to print. I do not, therefore object to a rather sketchy introduction, or notes that sometimes may appear too scanty to some readers. But a few of the statements made might be expressed somewhat more carefully. Giving a few details about the plays of Torres Naharro, evidently called for, since Torres Naharro used them to illustrate his critical views, the editor states that in the *Tinellaria* "Barrabás rises from the post of scullion to that of chief administrator." This, I venture, is a very minor point, and the rise does not take place, as one might think, in the play. Further, it would probably not be easy for most readers to recognize the *Soldadesca* from this description: "a sketch of the Spanish swashbuckler, the *matamoros* of Italian comedy" (p. 2).¹

¹ I am inclined to believe that both statements are due to a careless reading of Professor Crawford's chapter on Torres Naharro (*Spanish drama before Lope de Vega*, Philadelphia, 1922). There it is said that "We do not know the prototype of Barrabás, who rose in three years from the post of scullion to that of administrator of an important household." (p. 94) and also that "Many Italian plays contain the figure of the Spanish braggart soldier which, after making due allowance for national prejudice, serve to complement this picture given us by Naharro" (p. 95). But neither Guzmán, nor any other character, may fairly be called a swashbuckler.

Is it not also somewhat misleading to say that Torres Naharro "abides" by Dante's definition of tragedy and comedy in the letter to Can Grande, when this letter was not published until 1700? Finally it is a mistake to speak of Torres Naharro's "escaping from captivity" in Algiers, when it is definitely known that he was ransomed, "*pecuniaria cautione*."

The introductory notice to the reprint of Lope's *Arte Nuevo* contains some interesting hints on its influence in France. Morel-Fatio's note indicating that Lope was educated by the Jesuits should be modified since Lope's own statement on his schooling at the *Colegio de los Teatinos* contradicts that of Montalván in the *Fama póstuma*. As to the text itself, I am inclined to disagree with the complaint repeated by the editor after Morel-Fatio and Caramuel concerning line 137 ff. While intricate enough, the passage may be rendered closely as follows:

You may believe that it has been necessary to recall some of these things to your memory, so that you may see that you are asking me to write an *art* [my italics] of making plays in Spain, where everything that is written defies art, and [so that you may see] that [for me] to say how plays are made nowadays, in defiance of the ancient and logically grounded [art], is to take counsel from my practice, [but is] not the art, because art tells the truth, which the ignorant crowd opposes. If you want art etc.

The phrasing of the reference to Boyl's *El marido asegurado* (p. 37) might be confusing. It was not, of course, Mesonero's volume of *Dramáticos contemporáneos a Lope de Vega* which was published in 1616, but the *Norte de la Poesía española*.

So much for the 'average reader.' It may not be inopportune to allow also the 'specialist' to say a few words. These are mainly to express a regret that the texts have not been reproduced with 'philological' accuracy from the most reliable sources available. They are easily available in Europe, and of course, *Noblesse oblige!* This would not have been, I am sure, an undue claim on the editor, nor would it have unfitted the book for the public which is mainly expected to use it.

The extract from Torres Naharro's *Prohemio* is taken from Cañete's reprint (on p. 2, l. 31 read: *a lo principal*) and Schack provides the passage from Carvallo's *Cisne de Apolo*. The text from Figueroa's *Pasajero* follows the extracts given by Professor Crawford in his study of Figueroa, but a comparison with the text of the full edition by Professor Rose (Madrid, 1914) might have been advisable, and at least this edition might have been mentioned. What is worse, however, is to print extracts from Tirso's *Cigarrales* based on passages quoted in the introduction to Cotarelo's edition of Tirso's plays, when a transcript by a trained philologist, from the earliest available edition (1624), had already been printed by Morel-Fatio. Possibly the editor felt unwilling to

increase still further his very considerable debt to Morel-Fatio, but I submit that this would nevertheless have been the better course. In the case of Cueva's *Ejemplar poético* the old reprint of Sedano (1774) is used and (this is most regrettable) the excellent critical edition with notes by Walberg (*Acta Universitatis Lundensis*, xxxix, 1904) is not mentioned. Here the lack of adequate notes is noticeable. In commenting on the puzzling enumeration of dramatists by Cueva, rather than describe Mal Lara as "a lyric, not a dramatic author" (p. 8), would it not have been more to the point to recall Mal Lara's *lost* plays, his University-play *Locusta* (1548), his play on *Nuestra Señora de Consolación* at Utrera (1561), his tragedy of *Absalón* and probably one on San Hermenegildo (1570? Sánchez Arjona, *El Teatro en Sevilla*, 206 ff.) and perhaps also a comedy, *Los Celosos* (Wolf, *Studien*, 610)? It seems rash, positively to identify the 'Ortiz' mentioned by Cueva as Agustín Ortiz, author of the *Comedia Radiana*. It might be Lope Ortiz de Stúñiga, author of the lost *Farsa en coplas sobre la Comedia de Calixto y Melibea*. Or it might be neither of the two.

A last detail. The unnamed "French diplomatist, who took part in the negotiations for the peace of the Pyrenees" and whose description of a visit to Calderón is quoted in the opening paragraph, may be identified as François Bertaut, sieur de Fréauville, who accompanied, at a distance and unofficially, the embassy of the Maréchal de Grammont in quest of the hand of Maria-Teresa for Louis XIV.²

JOSEPH E. GILLET.

Bryn Mawr College.

The Defense of the Child by French Novelists. CLIFFORD STETSON PARKER. George Banta Publishing Co., Menasha, Wisconsin. 1925.

When sociologists run foul of literature, the result, for literature, is usually disastrous. Dr. Parker's work is, by style and matter, *hors la littérature*. He states in his preface that he "deals with non-literary influences upon literature," and he hopes to give a fuller understanding of the novelists in this way. He has failed dismally. As he admits in his conclusion: "literature has on the whole disdained to draw material (read *theses*) from the situations which the reformers were advertising." The book is obviously in-

² Cf. Foulché-Delbosc, *Bibliographie des voyages en Espagne*, in *Rev. hisp.* III, nrs. 87 H and 87 J. A reprint was published in the *Rev. hisp.* XLVII (1919). For details on Bertaut and his interest in the drama, see P.-L. Thomas, *François Bertaut et les conceptions dramatiques de Calderón*, in *Rev. de litt. comp.*, IV (1924), 199-222.

spired by Scheifley's *Brieux and Contemporary French Society* and might profitably be boiled down into an appendix to it. Scheifley's work has its merits, but those who deplore the invasion of literature by sociology may hope that its progeny will not be numerous. Dr. Parker's title is a misnomer. He refers to various laws passed in defense of children, but he is unable to prove any direct influence of the novels upon such laws. Moreover few if any outstanding novelists have written any important work with the purpose of attacking injustice to children. Dr. Parker quotes, usually in English,¹ bits in which cruelty to children is touched upon. The longest chapter in the book, *The Child's Right to Proper Schooling*, shows that many authors have censured the physical and moral conditions in the *lycées* and *collèges*, but, by Dr. Parker's own count, Jean Aicard's *L'Ame d'un Enfant* is the single instance of deliberate propaganda. And those of us who envy the results of the French boy's schooling will note with interest the remark: "Aicard has no fault to find with the instruction from the purely intellectual point of view." The one merit I have discovered in Dr. Parker's work is that, in general, it refrains from exaggerating the thesis element in the French novelists.

BENJ. M. WOODBRIDGE.

Reed College.

Le Repas du Lion. By F. DE CUREL. Edited by Alexander G. Fite. New York, Oxford University Press, 1926. 185 pages. \$1.00.

Dr. Fite, because of his intimate knowledge of the author and his environment, is highly qualified to interpret Curel to an American public, and his introduction is a model of its kind, for careful scholarship, picturesque charm of style, and complete understanding of the author's spirit. After treating fully Curel's ancestry, environment, and life, a knowledge of which is essential for an appreciation of this semi-biographical play, Dr. Fite proceeds to show that the dramatist, far from starting with some preconceived moral or thesis in the manner of Shaw, Brieux, Ibsen, or Hervieu, leaves his characters free to develop about a given situation. Possibly it would have been clearer, if he had not used the terms "thesis play" and *pièce à idées* interchangeably, and instead of defending Curel from the charge of too great fondness for the *pièce à idées*, had reserved this term as a glorious tribute for the genre which he represents. Perhaps the most eloquent of the pas-

¹ It is a bit disconcerting to find, in the bibliography of a doctorate dissertation, *Les Misérables* mentioned only in an English translation.

sages in Dr. Fite's introduction are those in which he praises the lofty poetry of nature in Curel's rendering of the Lorraine forests.

The editor is entirely justified, since the work is obviously designed for fairly advanced students, in restricting the vocabulary to the more difficult words; however, a study of the first three pages reveals several words, *ébrancher*, *tricotés*, *office des morts*, and *fourgonnant* (all in the stage directions), which need explanation for the average student. Aside from this reservation, the vocabulary shows evidence of extreme care and familiarity with even the subtler shades of meaning. The note on *C'est-y pas* (p. 18, l. 18) might profitably come earlier (page 5, l. 18). The notes are wholly adequate in explaining the various technical and dialectical difficulties, and furnish much illuminating material concerning the background of the play. The reviewer wishes to congratulate the editor on the small number of errata. A typographical error on p. 157, l. 10, the appearance of *pièce d' idées* for *pièce à idées* (p. xviii) and of Creusot for Le Creusot (p. vi), were the only ones observed.

MAXWELL A. SMITH.

University of Chattanooga.

The Influence of the Arthurian Romances on the Five Books of Rabelais. By NEMOURS H. CLEMENT. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1926. University of California Publications in Modern Philology, Vol. 12, no. 3, pp. 147-257.

This dissertation, presented for the doctorate at the University of Chicago, sets forth an interesting theory regarding the composition of Rabelais's books. The author first discusses the theories advanced by Plattard, Schneegans, Lefranc, and others as to the influence of Folengo, Pulci, the *Grandes Chroniques*, the Romances of Chivalry, and the geographical discoveries of the day and, while finding in them a good deal that is true, concludes that Rabelais's work is

a burlesque imitation of the French medieval romances, but particularly of the romances of the Round Table: Books I and II are an imitation of the Arthurian Romances in general, of which the *Great Prose Lancelot* is a representative specimen; Books III, IV, and V are an imitation of the Grail-quest romances.

He argues that these works offer, in addition to similarities of detail, a greater number of structural resemblances to *Pantagruel* and *Gargantua* than any others and that the *Quart Livre* is essentially a quest with the *dive bouteille* taking the place of the Holy Grail. *Pantagruel* and *Panurge* become crusaders, but the quest

is that of the truth—*jusqu'au feu exclusivement*—rather than the mystic values sought by their predecessors. The theory is ably stated. Whether it will satisfy the crusaders of scholarship remains to be seen. It is, I think, as good a solution as any other, if we must limit Rabelais to a single predominating group of models, but the absence of love in his books and the importance of giants in the first two makes me wonder whether he hitched his waggon to the Grail-star, whether he did not prefer to drive it now this way and now that, as the many authors he imitates and his many personal contacts might direct.

In other words, however good a case Dr. Clement has made out for Arthurian influence, has he considered sufficiently the claims of other sources? An example, small in itself, but perhaps typical, will suffice to illustrate this point. On p. 244 he makes the following statement:

In at least two cases Rabelais translates almost word for word Pulci's description of imaginary animals: the animal he calls "cucrocute" he takes from Pulci, xxv, 313, where it is called "leucrocute," and the serpent he calls "catoblepe" Rabelais takes from xxv, 314, where it is called by the same name.

The resemblance is certainly striking if we look no further than Pulci, but if we compare the Elder Pliny, who must be the latter's source, we see that Rabelais is even nearer to him than he is to Pulci. The catoblepe, for instance, is called a serpent by Pulci only and he does not compare it, as do both Pliny and Rabelais, to the basilisk. I could easily support this contention at greater length, not only from the descriptions of these two beasts, but from those of other animals mentioned by the three authors. It will, however, be sufficient to give the reader the reference indicated long ago in Burgaud des Marets's edition of Rabelais, II, 453, to Pliny, *Nat. Hist.*, lib. VIII, cap. XXI, §§ 72-78.

H. CARRINGTON LANCASTER.

Sketches from Eighteenth Century America. More "Letters from an American Farmer" by St. John de Crèvecoeur. Edited by HENRI L. BOURDIN, RALPH H. GABRIEL and STANLEY T. WILLIAMS. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1925. 332 pp. and Index. \$4.

This book is a new attempt to introduce to the general public a French traveler and author of some importance. Crèvecoeur came to America first as a traveler (1754 or 1755) and later as French consul to New York (1783-1790, two years of which time he was absent on leave in France). During these visits he distinguished himself in map-making, in improving agricultural methods, and

in establishing a packet-boat system between the United States and France. His literary work is represented by *Lettres d'un Cultivateur Américain*, one-, two-, and three-volume editions of which appeared successively in English in 1782 and in French in 1785 and 1787 and *Voyage dans la haute Pensylvanie et dans l'état de New-York*, a three-volume edition of which appeared in French in 1801. Translations of these books in other languages were published later.

The editors of *Sketches of Eighteenth Century America* do not propose to present the essays in a scholarly fashion or to trace their origin. They do not reproduce the exact text of Crèvecoeur,¹ nor do they show in detail the relationship which might exist between the five² old essays and the seven others which are published wholly or in part for the first time. Their belief that they have made a real discovery and their discrimination between "philology" (?) and "literary work" are shown in the introductory articles. Their contribution consists in the presentation to the public of an underestimated author in an interesting, readable volume, containing a recasting of some old material and an addition of new material found for the first time among the Crèvecoeur manuscripts in France.

The following essays are entirely new: "Ant-Hill Town,"³ "Liberty of Worship,"⁴ "The English and the French Before the Revolution,"⁴ "The Wyoming Massacre," and "Landscapes."⁵ "Thoughts of an American Farmer on Various Rural Subjects"⁶

¹ The editors state this on p. 36.

² The statement that these papers "have, with four exceptions, lain unpublished for nearly a century and a half in the cabinets of the family of Crèvecoeur in France" (p. 2) is evidently a typographical error since there are five essays or papers in this book which the editors acknowledge as having been published in French.

³ Although I find in the description of an orchard—"Did you ever unmoved pass by a large orchard in full bloom without feeling an uncommon ravishment, etc." (pp. 54-55)—a reminiscence of the *Cultivateur Américain*, I, 81: "Avez-vous jamais visité un grand verger fleuri sans en être ému? . . ."

⁴ The editors call this in the original a part of "A Snow Storm as It affects the American Farmer," but in the Cuchet edition of 1787 to which they refer there is no reference to a similar subject in the "Description d'une Chute de Neige."

⁵ The editors (p. 21) note Robert de Crèvecoeur's indication that the "Landscapes" existed in manuscript form. (*Saint John de Crèvecoeur sa vie et ses ouvrages*).

⁶ The extent to which Crèvecoeur introduced old material into the articles in the "Sketches" is here given (as also in note 7). It is to be regretted that it was not noted by the editors. This is divided into four parts. The general tone reminds us of "Pensées d'un Cultivateur Américain sur son sort & les Plaisirs de la Campagne" (*Lettres*, I, 52-88). The part entitled "Farm Life" with its homage to England resembles somewhat a similar tribute in the *Lettres* (I, 52). The preparation of maple trees for bleeding occurs also in the *Voyage*. Part two, "Enemies of the

and "The American Belisarius"⁷ show some resemblance with the *Lettres* and the *Voyage*. The other five essays are acknowledged as having been published before in French: "A Snow Storm as it affects the American Farmer,"⁸ "Reflections on the Manners of the Americans,"⁹ "The Man of Sorrows,"¹⁰ "History of Mrs. B,"¹¹ and "The Frontier Woman."¹²

Farmer," is reminiscent of passages in the *Voyage* (Vol. II), although not an exact translation of any one part. The kingbird is mentioned in both the *Sketches* (pp. 115-116) and the *Lettres* (I, 66-68); in the former as an enemy of kites, hawks, and crows, and in the latter as an enemy of bees. Part three, "Customs" contains accounts of dyeing garments by natural methods and of setting fire to leaves for the benefit of the undergrowth, traces of which occur in the *Voyage*. The two anecdotes about an Indian dog and a sassafras tree are, as the editors note, translated into French as the longer "Anecdote d'un Chien Sauvage" (L, I, 223-236) and "Anecdote du Sassafras et de la Vigne sauvage" (L, I, 249-255). Part four, "Implements," reminds us also of parts of the *Voyage* but there are no parallel passages. These four parts are named by the editors.

"The American Belisarius" is for the most part new material but there are striking resemblances with the "Histoire de S. K."—as to the name of the colonist, as to his removal from the sea to the country for the benefit of his children, and as to his generosity and mode of living. In these respects "The American Belisarius" resembles the "Histoire de S. K." more closely than the chapter entitled "Reflections on the Manners of the Americans" which the editors claim to have been the original from which the "Histoire de S. K." was translated. However, the conclusions are different. S. K. in the *Letters* lives at ease as the legislator of his own county, has prepared a picturesque burying ground for his family and allows St. John to write upon a stone wall surrounding the first tree that has been felled an inscription commemorating his bounty. Unlike the S. K. of the *Lettres* the American Belisarius suffers at the hands of his brothers-in-law and joins the Indian forces for protection. His wife is delirious, his son has gone, and his property is destroyed. After trial and release on bail he lives in a small part of his own house which had been allotted to him.

⁸ This was translated by "Description d'une Chute de Neige" in the 1787 edition of the *Lettres* (I, 289-314) as the editors state. These two versions are in general the same except that the *Sketches* omit some details and that the *Lettres* lack the concluding sentence of the *Sketches*.

⁹ The editors indicate that this essay appeared in the 1787 edition (*Lettres*, I, 120-149) as "Histoire de S. K. Colon Américain." While this is true in the main, the English version is briefer, conversations are omitted, and there are fewer introductory paragraphs. Moreover, the conclusions are different. Without going into greater detail, it may be indicated that 'S. K.' instead of remaining a plain farmer as he does in the *Sketches* becomes the founder and legislator of a county. The possible connection of the "Histoire de S. K. . . ." with "The American Belisarius" is indicated above.

¹⁰ This is the original version of an essay which, as the editors state, Crèvecoeur published in French as "Pensées sur la Guerre Civile, Histoire de Joseph Wilson" (*Lettres* I, 315-335). These two versions are practically the same except that in the *Sketches* the name Joseph Wilson is not mentioned and the conclusion is a more elaborate philosophical discourse than that of the *Lettres*.

¹¹ The editors note that this was the original from which Crèvecoeur

Since the editors of *Sketches of Eighteenth Century America* republish a considerable amount of old material, it might have been well to add certain other interesting essays, such as "L'Homme des Frontières" (*Lettres*, II, 249-276), "Pensées sur l'Esclavage & sur les Nègres" (*Lettres*, II, 372-385), and various anecdotes in the *Voyage* which also give an insight into eighteenth century America.

HELEN R. REESE.

Johns Hopkins University.

Thomas Chaucer. By MARTIN B. RUUD. Research Publications of the University of Minnesota, Minneapolis, 1926. Pp. 131. Price, \$1.50.

Professor Ruud has performed a useful service in settling beyond further question a long-disputed detail of Chaucerian biography, a detail the implications of which make clearer the poet's social status, and contribute towards the interpretation of certain of his writings. Barring the discovery of new evidence—and the painstaking thoroughness of Mr. Ruud's researches makes such a discovery improbable—this monograph should be the final word on the subject, establishing beyond reasonable doubt that Thomas Chaucer, Esquire (circa 1370-1434), a prosperous landed proprietor in Oxfordshire, chief butler to Henry IV and Henry V, five times Speaker of the House of Commons, the holder of many important offices under the king, and the father of Alice, Duchess of Suffolk, was own son to the poet.

But the value of Mr. Ruud's study goes beyond the establishment of this fact. He has gathered together, and has printed or summarized, every bit of information which has survived about the career of Thomas Chaucer; and this information, derived in large part from unprinted documents in the Public Record Office, should prove of great interest to students of the social and governmental history of fifteenth-century England. Particularly illuminating is the full account of the duties and methods of a chief butler, given on pages 38-57.

The sonship of Thomas to the poet Geoffrey was asserted by Speght in his 1598 edition of Chaucer, but with the added sentence: "Yet some hold opinion (but I know not upon what

translated into French the "Histoire de Rachel Budd. . ." (*Lettres*, I, 397-418) though slight variations occur.

¹² This corresponds to "La Femme des Frontières" (*Lettres*, I, 335-344) as the editors state. The opening paragraph of the *Lettres* is missing in the *Sketches*.

grounds) that Thomas Chaucer was not the sonne of Geffrey Chaucer, but rather some kinsman of his, whome hee brought up." Modern scholarship, with its strong tendency to discredit tradition, has magnified the doubt. Furnivall violently rejected the alleged relationship. Professor J. E. Wells in his *Manual of the Writings in Middle English* (1916) sums up the matter with the words: "The argument becomes very attenuated, and the relationship between Thomas and Geoffrey is not established" (p. 617). The relationship is strongly maintained by Professor Aage Brusendorff in his recent book, *The Chaucer Tradition* (1925), pages 31-37. This book had apparently not reached Professor Ruud at the time his monograph went to press. The clear, logical argument of Mr. Ruud stands in sharp contrast with the confused discussion of Dr. Brusendorff.

Mr. Ruud's evidence is only in part new. He has found an account, printed but hitherto neglected, by a sixteenth-century antiquary and herald, of a stained glass window which formerly stood in the parish church of Woodstock (where Thomas Chaucer held estates), in which the arms of Geoffrey Chaucer impale those of Burghersh. "Can there be any doubt about the meaning? The natural interpretation is that Geoffrey Chaucer's son was married to a Burghersh. And Thomas Chaucer we know was the husband of Maude Burghersh, whose arms are blazoned repeatedly on his tomb" [in Ewelme Church]. For the rest, the argument is based mainly on a new examination and appraisal of evidence already familiar—the statement of Gascoigne, the reliability of which Mr. Ruud ably vindicates; the fact that Thomas used the seal of "[G]hofrai Chaucier" to attest an important document in 1409.

I think no one can examine the evidence here arrayed without accepting its validity. The only serious argument on the other side is the fact that Lydgate in his "Balade . . . at the departyng of Thomas Chaucyer on Ambassade in to Fraunce," the text of which Mr. Ruud reprints in an appendix, makes no mention of the relationship. It is indeed a strange omission on the part of a poet so eager as Lydgate to pay tribute to the memory of his great master. But this *argumentum e silentio* can hardly weigh heavily against the positive evidence on the other side. It is a curious fact that none of the many documents which relate to Thomas Chaucer mentions his father's name. Perhaps to his contemporaries his descent was so well-known that any mention of it would have been superfluous.

The establishment of this relationship carries with it several important corollaries. For one thing, it identifies the poet's wife, Philippa. It is clear beyond dispute that Thomas Chaucer's mother was a member of the family of Roet; and the relations existing between Thomas and Cardinal Beaufort, who addresses

him as "consanguineus noster," make it reasonably certain that she was a sister of Katherine Swynford, mistress and later wife of John of Gaunt. Geoffrey Chaucer is then a connection by marriage of the great Duke of Lancaster. In the second place, it tends to strengthen the probability that the statements of Lydgate, closely associated with Thomas Chaucer, about Chaucer the poet, rest on a reliable foundation of first-hand knowledge. Thomas, it must be remembered, was a man of thirty at the time of the poet's death. Finally, there is for those of us to whom Geoffrey Chaucer is not only a great poet, but in some sort a personal friend, a satisfaction in knowing that his stock was so honorably continued by a son who attained high distinction in public affairs, and who was, as all the evidence gathered by Mr. Ruud clearly shows, a generous and kindly gentleman.

ROBERT K. ROOT.

Princeton University.

Wolfram von Eschenbach. Sechste Ausgabe von Karl Lachmann, bearbeitet von EDUARD HARTL. Berlin, Walter de Gruyter & Co., 1926. lxxxii, 640 pp.

Almost a century has elapsed since the appearance of Lachmann's edition of Wolfram. Haupt, Müllenhoff, and Weinhold, who saw the later editions through the press, limited themselves to the emendation of palpable errors and misprints, without attempting to incorporate the advances of scholarship made since Lachmann's day. The latter had used, for *Parzival*, 8 complete mss. and 9 fragments: to-day 17 complete mss. and 57 more or less extensive fragments are accessible. It was time, therefore, that the evidence of these new witnesses should be taken into account. This task Dr. Eduard Hartl, of Munich, has undertaken, with due consideration for the work of the man whose name the edition bears.

Lachmann, as is well known, came to the conclusion that the St. Gall ms. *D* and those most closely related to it offered the best text, from which he departed only for the most cogent reasons: the group headed by the Munich ms. *G* was stigmatized as of distinctly inferior value. An independent opinion of the worth of the several mss. was difficult, or even impossible, as only a small selection of their readings was given in the apparatus, where moreover, no individual symbols were used, *g* indicating one ms. and *gg* several mss. of the "inferior" group. One could not depart from Lachmann's text, therefore, without an independent study of all the mss. Hartl began his task by collating, copying, or photographing all the known mss. of *Parzival*, whether complete or fragmentary. A preliminary checking up soon convinced him that

only two alternatives were possible: either to perpetuate the traditional Lachmann text of 1833 practically intact, or to undertake an entirely new redaction on the basis of all the material now available. The latter is Hartl's ultimate aim, which, however, he cannot attempt to realize until all of his material has been completely digested. In the present edition, therefore, he states the problem, contenting himself for the time being with a reproduction of the received text. Here there were numerous errors and misprints to be detected and removed, particularly in the apparatus.

In general, Hartl comes to the conclusion that *D*, while one of the best mss., has frequent errors, which may be corrected by a proper evaluation of the relation of all the mss. to each other. Even in the *G*-group there are mss. whose textual value is fully equal to that of *D*. In Lachmann's eyes this would of course be rank heresy. It is probable that Hartl's final results will be similar to those of Braune in his incisive study of the mss. of the *Nibelungenlied*: here also Lachmann, through thick and thin, had adhered to the readings of a single ms. (*A*) which he considered superior to all the others, whereas Braune proved conclusively that the authentic reading is frequently to be found in mss. of groups *B* and *C*.

We shall look forward with the keenest interest to a detailed account of Hartl's findings, promised in his forthcoming *Textgeschichte des Parzival*.

W. KURRELMAYER.

Hoccleve's Works. II. The Minor Poems in the Ashburnham MS.

Addit. 133, edited by Sir ISRAEL GOLLANCZ. Early English Text Society, Extra Series LXXIII. Pp. viii + 40. London, 1924 (for 1897). 5s.

In vol. LXI of this series Furnivall listed the poems of Hoccleve preserved in the Ashburnham MS., and gave some account of their contents (pp. xxvii ff.), but he did not print them. Professor Gollancz now makes them available to us, and for this service we are grateful. Everybody who reads it will particularly enjoy Hoccleve's humorous "Praise of his Lady," from which I extract the following detail (p. 37):

Hir nose a pentice is, þat it ne shal
Reyne in hir mowth thogh shee vprightes lay.

Professor Gollancz is to be congratulated, and envied, for the good fortune by which this MS. became his.

KEMP MALONE

Johns Hopkins University.

The Threshold of Anglo-Saxon, by A. J. Wyatt. Cambridge. At the University Press. 1926 (New York, The Macmillan Co.). Pp. xiv + 126.

An Anglo-Saxon Chronicle. Edited by E. Classen and F. E. Harmer. Manchester. At the University Press. 1926 (New York, Longmans, Green and Co., \$1.75). Pp. xvi + 150.

Mr. Wyatt describes his book as an elementary reader, and adds: "my set purpose in this little book is to avoid dullness and difficulty." He tries to bring his selections "within the range of the beginner, by means of a normalized text, copious notes, and a simple glossary." He culls mainly from *The Chronicle* and *Beowulf*. The reading-matter is preceded by six pages of "Grammar," which, being interpreted, means morphology. Obviously the editor would have the beginner start reading at once, picking up, as he goes along, the minimum of grammar needed for understanding the text. The method has its advantages; it is to be recommended, indeed, for a course in Old English designed for Freshman or Sophomores. Graduate students, needless to say, must have different treatment, even though they come into the Graduate School wholly innocent of Old English. A course in elementary Old English which left out historical grammar could hardly be called a graduate course at all, even by courtesy. Unfortunately there is little demand, in this country, for high school and junior college courses in Old English, and Mr. Wyatt's little book will therefore hardly be much used in America.

The editor's terminology will also interfere with the popularity of the book, I think. The truth is, Mr. Wyatt here falls between two stools. Some philologists (like Professor Legouis) exclude *Beowulf* altogether from English literature, and apply to the writings of pre-Conquest England the term *Anglo-Saxon*. Others (like Professor Cook) hold that *Beowulf* is a part of English literature, and apply the term *English* to the writings of England, whether pre- or post-Conquest. Each of these two positions has the merit of consistency. But Mr. Wyatt's book is neither fish nor flesh. We read *Anglo-Saxon* on one page, *English* on the next. The trimmer is well-known to us in politics, and there, no doubt, serves a useful purpose. But surely in scholarship such compromises are out of place. *Beowulf* either is an English poem, or it is not. Let Mr. Wyatt ponder this fact, and revise his terms to fit. And if he plumps for *Anglo-Saxon*, let him not fail, in his glossary, to gloss *Englisc* with 'Anglo-Saxon' (like Marstrand). For a man ought to have the courage of his convictions, and, if he is a true scholar, ought to take, without flinching, the consequences of his terminology.

Mr. Classen and Miss Harmer give us an edition of a single text of the *Chronicle*, the so-called text D. This text was chosen (as we learn in a "Prefatory Note" contributed by Mr. T. F. Tout) because, though for various reasons worthy of special treatment, it had never been published by itself. The work of editing the text was undertaken by Mr. Classen at the suggestion of the late W. P. Ker; when the editor found himself unable to complete his task, Miss Harmer agreed to complete it in his stead. The text is published for the use of students rather than of philologists already trained, and of course it is not intended to supersede, even in part, the work of Plummer. The editors have done a good job, and the edition may safely be recommended for use in the classroom or in "outside reading."

KEMP MALONE.

Johns Hopkins University.

Words Ancient and Modern. By ERNEST WEEKLEY. Pp. viii + 163. E. P. Dutton and Co., New York, 1926.

Professor Weekley is a well-known etymologist who has "gone in" for the popularization of knowledge. Such works of his as *The Romance of Words* and *The Romance of Names* have made his name familiar to the lexicographical amateurs. His latest book belongs to the same genre. It consists of 74 little essays, each dealing with the history of a word. The arrangement of the essays is alphabetical. Mr. Weekley writes in a sprightly, informal way that ought to win him many readers, since what he says is interesting for its own sake and is made more so by the author's way of putting it. A certain tendency to cheapness may be noticed now and then (as at the beginning of the essay on *Democracy*), but this tendency belongs to our age, and, I fear, neither the reviewer nor anybody else of the present generation is entitled to throw any stones. Mr. Weekley does not invent his etymologies; he knows the authorities and uses them. But his method makes him a little careless: when you are writing for the general public you don't have to mind your p's and q's as you do when you are aiming at a learned bull's-eye. Hence we find the author telling us (p. 45) that "*fellow* and *companion* formed for many centuries one of those pairs of words, one native the other French, so numerous in our language," although of course he knows perfectly well that *fellow* is not native, but got from the Scandinavian.

KEMP MALONE.

Johns Hopkins University.

The Life and Works of Edward Coote Pinckney. Prepared by
THOMAS OLLIVE MABBOTT and FRANK LESLIE PLEADWELL.
The Macmillan Company, 1926. xvi, 233 pp.

The poetry of the South has been characteristically lyric. Poe, Lanier, and Timrod escaped the heresy of sustained effort prevalent in the first half of the century as well as much of the equally prevalent didacticism. Their best poems are among the most finished and melodious of American lyrics, and their work has long been available in modern editions. The poet of the nineteenth century South whose name should stand next to theirs, a poet whose lyric note was so pure and fine that it was not surpassed in America in his day, has waited a century for an inclusive edition. Although his name and two or three delicate love lyrics were known to every reader of anthologies, the 1825 volume of poems was so small a book and so excessively rare that even special students of American literature did not know it.

The collaboration which has repaired the neglect of so many years was fortunate. Captain Pleadwell's happy discovery in a Baltimore bookshop of Mrs. Pinckney's album enriched the scanty store of material already available and wakened an interest which as an officer of the United States Navy he could particularly well indulge. Dr. Mabbott brought to the undertaking a lifelong devotion to American literature and practised skill in recondite research. The result is a thoroughly adequate book.

Pinckney's brief, eventful life recalls in many respects that of Edgar Allan Poe. Like Poe he spent part of his boyhood in England and attended an English school. At the age of nine he returned to America and had further schooling in Baltimore. At thirteen he was a midshipman, embarked upon such a romantic career as Poe seems to have coveted. And in the end, after doubtful success in other callings and the publication of a volume of poems, he turned to journalism and became editor of *The Marylander*.

Although to us Pinckney seems both as a naval officer and as an editor needlessly concerned about his rights and absurdly eager to vindicate his honor, he doubtless represents his time; and his verse had a cultural background in Maryland that has been strangely neglected by the literary historians. Here, midway between the sections, there flourished a remarkable interest in books and an active creative impulse, spending itself—naturally, in view of the free pirating of British books—in the production of ephemeral periodicals. Pinckney's lyrics are its finest flower. They are narrow in range but mature and finished in workmanship, and notably free from the common faults of youth and provincialism. His "Health," "Serenade," and two or three love songs will continue

to be all that the general reader will treasure; but the student of American literature will want to know the man and his other verse, including the fragments that his early death left uncompleted; and they will be grateful for a thoroughgoing critical edition of his work.

JOHN C. FRENCH.

Satan et le Satanisme dans l'Oeuvre de Victor Hugo. By MAXIMILIEN RUDWIN. Paris: Les Belles-Lettres, 1926. xiv + 156 pp. Bibliographie de Victor Hugo, by MAXIMILIEN RUDWIN. Paris: Les Belles-Lettres, 1926. viii + 44 pp.

L'auteur a le très grand et très rare mérite d'avoir pendant près de quinze ans consacré ses efforts patients et suivis à l'exploration systématique d'un territoire encore fort mal connu. Il en a été récompensé par plusieurs riches trouvailles; il a appelé l'attention des historiens de la littérature sur un courant négligé, mais non sans importance. Il convient tout d'abord de l'en remercier et de l'en féliciter. L'ouvrage qu'il vient de publier sur Victor Hugo contient la synthèse de ses travaux antérieurs sur le satanisme en France au dix-neuvième siècle. Il est rempli d'aperçus nouveaux et intéressants; l'auteur me permettra cependant d'exprimer le regret qu'il n'ait pas disposé de plus de temps pour clarifier et ordonner le travail qu'il nous donne aujourd'hui.

Dans ce livre écrit un peu "à la diable," l'expression est ici à sa place, M. Rudwin a entassé ses fiches et ses notes de lecture, ses réflexions et ses conclusions souvent fort contradictoires; il a mis côte à côte des notations pénétrantes et de véritables enfantillages et, pour avoir voulu trop prouver, il a, par endroits, commis de véritables contre-sens.

Parmi beaucoup d'autres, voici quelques assertions de M. Rudwin qui me semblent au moins discutables: "Satan est le fil d'Ariane de l'oeuvre de Victor Hugo" (p. xi);—"Le roman social des *Misérables* est rempli de la démonologie d'une grande ville" (p. 59), après quoi M. Rudwin consacre en tout onze lignes au roman et reconnaît qu' "il est peu question du diable lui-même dans les *Misérables*;"—"Victor Hugo a toujours considéré la Révolution française comme l'oeuvre de Satan" (p. 68);—"Victor Hugo comme tous ses congénères (*sic*) était pessimiste" (p. 76). Le fait que Jehan Frolo est "un vrai diable," que "le petit gamin Gavroche est un satan," qu'un "garçon de Torteval est un petit satan de français" (pp. 124-125), que "Victor Hugo aimait tant les contes diaboliques qu'il les racontait même aux enfants" (p. 34) et bien d'autres encore ne prouvent absolument rien. Enfin, quand M. Rudwin indiquant la vogue actuelle en France de la

littérature démoniaque, dit que "pour couronner cette phalange infernale, le Théâtre du Petit-Monde prépare une reprise de *Un bon petit diable*," accusant ainsi la bonne comtesse de Ségur de donner dans le satanisme, il n'arrive pas à me convaincre. La vérité est que le "diable" depuis longtemps ne fait plus trembler même les petits enfants et surtout les petits Parisiens qui peuvent le voir deux fois par semaine au Guignol des Champs Elysées et du Luxembourg et je ne crois pas pour ma part que Victor Hugo ait eu à "s'affranchir des frayeurs et des terreurs d'enfance" (p. 42). Ce qui est également vrai, c'est qu'à l'époque romantique le diable était déjà tellement usé qu'il a fallu le nommer Satan ou Lucifer pour lui rendre quelque dignité. Il est fort regrettable que M. Rudwin n'ait pas plus nettement établi cette distinction entre le "diable" de la conversation courante, le "diable" de Guignol, des contes de fées et des légendes et le Satan romantique.

Ces réserves faites, et il importait de les faire, le livre de M. Rudwin contient des choses excellentes. Le chapitre II, *Satan et l'antithèse*, p. 42, est tout à fait exact, bien que trop court; il en est de même du chapitre VIII, *Le satanisme et le manichéisme*, p. 76 et du chapitre IX, *Le satanisme et le messianisme*. Là M. Rudwin est vraiment dans son sujet et il faut lui savoir gré d'avoir attiré l'attention sur la *Fin de Satan*, ordinairement trop négligée, et qui renferme de grandes beautés. La réhabilitation de Satan a permis aux romantiques de renouveler un thème qu'ils ont trouvé bien usé et d'en faire un symbole. On peut se demander s'ils ont toujours réussi. Dans le détail on se refusera sans doute à suivre toujours M. Rudwin, mais on souscrira à sa conclusion juste et modérée que "le Satan de Victor Hugo est sans relief et sans couleur" (p. 106).

J'aurai peu à dire sur la *Bibliographie de Victor Hugo* que M. Rudwin destine plus à ses élèves qu'au grand public. On y trouvera un supplément fort utile aux articles de la bibliographie de Lanson et de celle de Thieme. On y trouvera peut-être trop même, car il n'était pas nécessaire d'énumérer (p. 2) des manuels élémentaires ou de nombreuses études de deuxième ou troisième ordre.

GILBERT CHINARD.

Über den Einfluss der lateinischen Vagantendichtung auf die Lyrik Walthers von der Vogelweide und die seiner Epigonen im 13. Jahrhundert, von Dr. W. H. MOLL. Amsterdam, 1925.

This work antedates that of Brinkmann, to whom it was however unknown, and anticipates his results, so far as Walther von der Vogelweide is concerned. Its author was on the other hand fami-

liar with earlier works of Brinkmann, which he cites. He also makes a careful comparison between the poetry of the *Vaganten* and that of the troubadours. His conception of the relation between the two, however, is that of a parallel development out of scholastic poetry, which is perhaps less appealing than that of Brinkmann. The author accepts the conclusion of Frantzen that there is no satisfactory evidence of the existence of popular love-poetry which could have exerted an influence upon the *Vaganten*. The conclusion then drawn is that when the Middle High German *Minnesang* turned from the conventional to the fresh and more natural direction, it is in the Latin poetry of the *Vaganten* that the impulse is to be sought, which agrees with Brinkmann's theory as to Walther. In fact the two works are mutually confirmatory in a high degree. Moll, however, makes a special point of demonstrating that many features of correspondence between Walther and the *Vaganten* are quite lacking in the *Minnesang* before Walther. This is not inconsistent with Brinkmann's conclusions, if it is not intended to deny the influence of the *Vaganten* upon Walther's forerunners, but merely to prove their fresh and greater influence upon him. The cases of striking agreement between poems of Walther and medieval Latin ones are all discussed and attention is especially called to points of similarity between Walther and the Archipoeta, showing presumably direct influence of the latter upon the former.

The influence of the *Vaganten* is further found in various poets of the thirteenth century, successors to Walther, which influence may be either direct or indirect through Walther himself. Finally the rustic poetry represented by Neidhart and Tannhäuser shows clear connection with the verses of the itinerant scholars; the relation is here direct, that is, it cannot have been through Walther. As to Tannhäuser, the author accepts the theory that he was a runaway cleric, not a knight.

Also the didactic poetry of medieval Germany as represented by the *Spruch* of Walther and others is related to the medieval Latin poems in similar vein of the *Vaganten*. Marner was for example at the outset of his poetic activity a wandering scholar, and others of the didactic poets may also have been. Their sources and points of view agree remarkably with those of the *Vaganten*.

Cornell University.

A. LEROY ANDREWS.

Entstehungsgeschichte des Minnesangs, von H. BRINKMANN
(Kluckhohn & Rothacker, Deutsche Vierteljahrsschrift für
Literaturwissenschaft und Geistesgeschichte, 8. Bd.). Halle,
Niemeyer, 1926.

This follows closely upon the same author's *Geschichte der lateinischen Liebesdichtung im Mittelalter* (1925; a critical edition of medieval Latin love-poetry is also promised) and is itself included in the series initiated by Konrad Burdach's *Vorspiel*, to whom it is also dedicated. These facts will serve to indicate the general direction of the work. It is however noteworthy that upon one fundamental point the author disagrees with Burdach; viz., as to the latter's theory of an influence of the Moors in Spain upon the troubadour-poetry of southern France. In the same way he breaks with the May song theory of Gaston Paris. The contention of Jeanroy that the troubadour love-poetry is a spontaneous production of the French soil without foreign influence is also rejected. A starting-point is found in Angers, where in the tenth and beginning of the eleventh centuries there flourished great literary activity. Latin verse, particularly in epistolary form, was cultivated enthusiastically. This culture rested essentially upon a Christian or Church basis, but was transformed especially through the influence of Ovid and developed something of an erotic tendency. There was direct influence exercised by it upon the troubadours.

But this is the least important phase of the matter and one may readily get the impression of an over-emphasis of the importance of Angers and its literary activities, unless it is to be taken as a single illustration of more generally diffused interest, which is evidently what the author has in mind. More important is the connection already made by Dutch scholars, Salverda de Grave and Frantzen, with the medieval Latin poetry of the itinerant scholars (*Vaganten*). This line of influence is developed by the present author in greater detail, the various types of troubadour poetry being compared with their Latin prototypes.

As to the Middle High German *Minnesang*, the author regards the conjectured Romanic influence upon its earliest representatives as eliminated by the work of Vogt. Influence of the *Volkslied* is also denied. Where Schwietering had suggested Ovid as the important influence the present author prefers the medieval Latin of the *Vaganten*, i. e., again independently the same influence noted in the case of the troubadours. He believes that this type of love-poetry was cultivated first by the clerics and only later taken over by the knights. Again connection with the epistle is inferred, first with the epistle in Middle High German verse, which itself goes back to the medieval Latin epistle, likewise in verse.

The medieval Latin influence was not exerted once for all, but worked in one or another of its phases upon various successive *Minnesänger* down to and including Walther von der Vogelweide. Reinmar was an exception, and it was only in the second phase of Walther's poetic activity (from 1198 on), when he liberated himself from the Reinmar tradition, that the Middle Latin influence became directly effective upon him. Burdach had here wrongly assumed an influence of the *Volkslied*. Also Neidhart von Reuenthal was not free from such Middle Latin influence and the author intends in a subsequent work to follow up this influence upon the *Minnesang* of the thirteenth century.

All in all, the argument seems sound and the emphasis laid on the right factors. Among the astonishingly rich and varied literary currents of the Middle Age as elsewhere one may easily be oblivious of everything but his own course, but the present author does not attempt to exclude entirely other factors than the one in which he is primarily interested. One sees through his work as generally that the two great civilizing and cultural forces of the Middle Age were classical Rome and the Christian Church.

A. LEROY ANDREWS.

Cornell University.

The Old English Prose Tracts in MS. Cotton Vitellius A xv, edited with an introduction and glossarial index by Stanley Rypins. E. E. T. S., Orig. Ser. 161, London: Oxford University Press, 1924 (for 1921). 25/- and \$10.

The appearance of the three prose pieces which precede the *Béowulf* in the second codex of *MS. Cott. Vitell. A xv* and which with the *Judith* (immediately following the *Béowulf*) make up the contents of this codex is noteworthy in the history of OE. scholarship. With Professor A. S. Cook's edition of the *Judith* (Belles-Lettres Ser., 1904) and the *Béowulf* in Zupitza's autotypes we are at last in possession of trustworthy reproductions of that portion of the MS. so important for, let us say, *Béowulf* scholarship. The texts published are: 1. the *Letter of Alexander the Great to Aristotle*; 2. the rather closely related *Wonders of the East*; and 3. the fragmentary and really badly preserved *Life of St. Christopher*. There follow immediately as a sort of appendix three Latin texts which are closely related to the sources of the OE. pieces. Brief Notes and a Glossary end the volume. The whole is prefaced by a substantial and valuable Introduction.

The Introduction is sure to evoke general interest and discussion; here, however, it is only possible to direct attention to the

main features of this essay. It is divided into two parts, the first devoted to a study of the MS., the second to the substance and the sources of the texts; in both parts the editor makes positive contributions to knowledge. First and foremost, Mr. Rypins has given (pp. ix-xi) an account of the foliation of the codex, which corrects and supersedes all previous descriptions. Secondly, by a careful analysis of the technique of scribes A and B, he has come as near demonstrating as is possible the hitherto questioned accuracy of A and makes out a strong case for his superior accuracy over B. If Mr. Rypins' arguments are accepted, they will deal a mortal blow to the contrary theory developed by ten Brink and accepted to the present day (e.g. by Professor Klaeber, *Beowulf*, pp. xci-ii), and will necessitate a new approach to many of the problems concerning the lost *Beowulf* MS. from which A and B copied. As the editor intimates, much remains to be worked out; certainly the whole question of the apparent accuracy of B in his transcript of the *Judith* (e.g. consistency in *eo*-spellings) needs new thought and study. The apparent conservatism of B in the *Beowulf* (cf. lists in Klaeber, pp. xcii-iii) must be reconciled with the *Judith*. One all too rarely considered line of approach may lie in a study of possible methods of copying, namely, from a MS. direct or from dictation, also whether a scribe may not come from a region other than that of the dialect which he is copying or taking from dictation. May not this influence our attitude towards the sometimes postulated poetical koiné? Such, indeed, are the subtle and complicated possibilities.

Incidentally Mr. Rypins (pp. xiii-iv) makes the point—and like many good points, obvious though hitherto overlooked—that, if the MS. is to be dated ca. 1000, none of the prose pieces in it can be of later date. Certainly on this basis they can no longer be placed in the eleventh or twelfth centuries.

The second part of the Introduction (pp. xxix ff.) includes *inter alia* a splendid list (pp. xxxiv-v) of MSS. of the Latin *Epistula Alexandri ad Aristotilem* which will be of great value to students of the Alexander Legend; interesting as testifying to the popularity of this piece in pre-Conquest England is MS. Harl. 2632 of ca. 1000. The *Wonders of the East* (*de Rebus in Oriente Mirabilibus*), an interesting teratological tract that might be brought into relation with the *Liber Monstrorum* (famous among Anglists for its account of Hygelác's death) which contains Alexander material. The relation of the *Liber* to England is stressed by Antoine Thomas in a recent article "Un MS. inutilisé du *Liber Monstrorum*," *Bulletin DuCange: Archivum Latinitatis Medii Aevi*, 1 (1924), 232 ff., esp. pp. 244-45. It is regrettable that a place could not be found in an appendix for a transcript of the OE. version of the *Wonders*, preserved in MS. Cott. Tib. B v,

The introduction to the Christopher fragment is marred by an outburst, distressing only in its lack of urbanity, against the distinguished Anglist, Eugen Einkenkel.

The text has been carefully prepared; Mr. Rypins seems to have displayed the technique and the infinite patience necessary for extracting the last ounce of information from the MS. (cf. pp. viii-ix) and has presented the text folio for folio and line for line as in the original.

The Notes are brief but include the latest literature on the passages discussed; attention is directed to the Addenda, based on an article by Bradley and Sisam, on a separate slip pasted in to face p. 1 of the text.

The Glossary is full though not quite a concordance to the texts. Why is *-nis* "in every case changed" to *-nes*? The practice of listing compounds with *ge-* and *un-* under the simplexes strikes the reviewer as fundamentally bad; for these compounds (and others) constitute a veritable 'feature' of OE., the importance of which is to be emphasized rather than otherwise. Lexicographically these texts are valuable for certain rare and curious words used therein (see Mr. Rypins' lists on pp. xli-ii and xlvi). A few of these at least merit special notice: *ácégled* is certainly correctly glossed and should doubtless be connected with **cægél* 'a wooden peg'; to *cailis* noted in Toller's *Supplement* under *ácégled* should be added a reference to Germ. *Kegel*, *Kegelspiel*. After *cannon* is missing the reference to fol. 113b/19; the gloss 'cane' corrects the *Suppl.* The masc. (vs. fem.) gender of *epistol* is marked (p. xlii) as noteworthy; note that OE. aphetic *pistol* is regularly masc. and that the example of *epistol* in Bosworth is ambiguous; Old and Mod. Icel. *pistell* is, for instance, masc.; masc. is probably the regular gender in OE. for this loan from the Lat. fem. *epistula*. *Fēðerfóte* (and *fēðerfótnieten*) offers a new spelling of *fīðerfóte* recorded in Bosworth. *Bylifigeað*, cited under *bylifian* (? for *belifian*, normally meaning 'deprive of life'), would be better referred to an inf. *bylibban* (*bilibban* in Bosworth, 'to live by, on'); for the spelling of the 3pl., cf. Sievers-Cook, § 416 and esp. Note 2. *Génra*, adj. would be better referred to *gegn*, adj.; cf. *Suppl. s. v. Hio*, p. xlii, appears to be a misprint for *hiow*. *Hréadwæter* would be better cited as a cpd. of *hréod* 'reed' (q. v. in Glossary); for word-formation, cf. *Rohrau* (Austria), birth-place of the composer Haydn. *Hréogan* 'to get rough (of weather)' is accepted by the *Suppl.*; for the spelling with 'g' for 'w' (assuming the verb to be a derivative of *hréow*, adj.), see Sievers-Cook, § 295, Note 1 ad. fin. *Lauernbéam* looks like an obvious miswriting of *lauerbéam*. *Lauerisc* is an addition to the lexicons as is *onhongian* (vs. *onhón*) and *onlócian* (cf. recorded *onlóciend* 'onlooker'). Can *palther* be anything else than a crude misspelling (miswrit-

ing) of *panther*? cf. *pandher* in *Suppl.* After *rynig* is missing the reference to fol. 114b/12. *Yb-*, *ybféran*, and *ybsittan* should be silently (?) corrected to *ymb-*; is there any more need of preserving such obvious and very common omissions of the scribal macron than of preserving an equally obvious misprint in a quotation from a modern book? Numerous other forms and spellings occur which are in their way more noteworthy than those touched upon here, but which require too extended discussion: cf. *ealfara*, *foeran* sub *féran*, *glengista*, *gehluran*, and *lafor* (= *eafor*?, i. e. *eofor*, see *Suppl.* and Latin text).

The reviewer hopes to see ere long a fuller discussion by Mr. Rypins of the many fascinating problems which his book has broached and partly developed. Others, too, will have their say and express their appreciation of this interesting contribution to OE. studies.

F. P. MAGOUN, JR.

Cambridge, Mass.

RECENT PUBLICATIONS

GERMAN

Altwegg, Wilh.—Johann Peter Hebel. Ein Brief und drei Gedichte in des Dichters Handschrift. *Basel*: Helbing & Lichtenhahn, 1926. 11 pp., 16 leaves, 4°. M. 3.20.

Amoretti, G. V.—Hölderlin. *Torino*: Fratelli Bocca, 1926. 240 pp. L. 20. (Letterature moderne, vol. 12.)

Arnim, L. Achim von, u. Brentano, Clemens.—Des Knaben Wunderhorn. Alte deutsche Lieder. 2. Aufl. Theil 1-3. Heidelberg, Mohr u. Winter, 1819. [Photomech. Verfahren. *Tübingen*: Mohr, 1926]. 491; 448; 253, 103 pp. Boards, M. 60.

Bausteine.—Festschrift Max Koch zum 70. Geburtstag dargebr. . . hrg. v. Ernst Boehlich u. Hans Heckel. *Breslau*: Preuss & Jünger, 1926. v, 334 pp. M. 15.

Beck, Ernst.—Lautlehre der oberen Markgräfler Mundart. [Samml. kurzer Grammatiken deu. Mundarten. Bd. 10.] *Halle*: Waisenhaus, 1926. xx, 282 pp., 1 plate. M. 12.

Behaghel, Otto.—Deutsche Satzlehre. [Deutschkundliche Bücherei]. *Leipzig*: Quelle & Meyer, 1926. 56 pp. 60 Pf.

Berend, Ed.—Jean-Paul-Bibliographie. *Berlin*: J. Altmann, 1925. viii, 153 pp. Bound, M. 9.

Bolte, Johannes.—Eine ungedruckte Poetik Kaspar Stieler's. [S.-A. aus Sitzungsber. d. Preuss. Akad. d. Wiss. Phil.-hist. Kl. 1926, 15]. *Berlin*: de Gruyter, 1926. Pp. 97-122. M. 2.

Burdach, Konrad.—Der Dichter des Ackermann aus Böhmen u. s. Zeit. 1. Hälfte. [Vom Mittelalter zur Reformation. Bd. 3, Tl. 2]. *Berlin*: Weidmann, 1926. ix, lxviii, 202 pp. M. 21.

Ermatinger, Emil.—Barock und Rokoko in der deutschen Dichtung. [Gewalten u. Gestalten. 4]. *Leipzig*: Teubner, 1926. vii, 186 pp. M. 7.20.

Festa, Friedr.—Die schlesische Mundart Ostböhmens. 1. Die Lautlehre. [Beiträge z. Kenntnis sudetendeutscher Mundarten. 3.] *Prag*: Verein f. Gesch. d. Deutschen in Böhmen, 1926. viii, 104 pp. 4°. Ks. 12.

Frankenberger, Jul.—Walpurgis. Zur Kunstgestalt von Goethes Faust. (Mit e. Anh. über d. Erzämterzene d. 2. Tls.) [Staat. u. Geist. Bd. 2]. *Leipzig*: E. Wiegandt, 1926. 118 pp. M. 3.50.

Gordon, Wolf v.—Die dramatische Handlung in Sophokles' "König Oidipus" und Kleists "Der zerbrochene Krug." [Bausteine z. Gesch. d. deu. Lit. 20]. *Halle*: Niemeyer, 1926. v, 58 pp., 4 plates. M. 4.

Görres-Gesellschaft.—Literaturwissenschaftliches Jahrbuch. In Verb. m. J. Nadler u. Leo Wiese hrg. v. Günther Müller. Bd. 1. *Freiburg*: Herder, 1926. v, 161 pp. 4°. M. 6.

Goethe.—Offene Gegend. A Fragment of the Second Part of Faust in Goethe's hand. With Notes on Leopold J. Bernays' English Translation of the drama by William A. Speck. [Facsimiles and Reproductions of unique or rare items from the William A. Speck Collection of Goethiana in Yale Univ. Library, No. V.] *New Haven*: Yale Univ. Press, 1926. 7 leaves, folio.

Haasbauer, A.—Zur Geschichte der oberösterreich. Mundarten. [Prager deu. Studien. H. 39]. *Reichenberg i. B.*: F. Kraus, 1926. 60 pp. 4°. M. 2.40.

Herrmann, Chr.—Die Weltanschauung Gerhart Hauptmanns in seinen Werken. [Philos. Reihe. Bd. 82.] *Berlin*: Paetel, 1926. 93 pp. M. 1.

Hofmann, Fritz.—Niederhessisches Wbch., zusammengestellt auf Grund d. Mundart von Oberellenbach, Kreis Rotenburg (Fulda). [Deu. Dialektgeographie. H. 19]. *Marburg*: Elwert, 1926. v, 278 pp. M. 21.

Hoffmann-Krayer, Ed.—Geschichte des deutschen Stils in Einzelbildern. *Leipzig*: Quelle & Meyer [1926]. xii, 172 pp. Cloth, M. 6.

Jandebeur, Franz.—Reimwörterbücher u. Reimwortverzeichnisse zum 1. Büchlein, Erec, Gregorius, Armen Heinrich, den Liedern von Hartmann von Aue u. d. sog. 2. Büchlein. Mit e. Vorw. über d. Entwicklung d. deutschen Reimlexikographie. [Münchener Texte. Erg. Reihe: Reimwörterbuch. H. 5]. *München*: Callwey, 1926. 155 pp. M. 12.

Kienast, R.—Joh. Val. Andreae und die vier echten Rosenkreutzer-Schriften. [Palaestra. 152]. *Leipzig*: Mayer & Müller, 1926. viii, 248 pp. M. 16.

Kissling, Helmut.—Die Ethik Frauenlobs (Heinrichs von Meissen). [Sächs. Forschungsinstitute, Forschungsinstitut f. neuere Philol. 1. Altgerm. Abt., H. 3]. *Halle*: Niemeyer, 1926. xi, 160 pp. M. 8.

Klenze, Camillo v.—From Goethe to Hauptmann. Studies in a Changing Culture. *New York*: Viking Press, 1926. 321 pp.

Kluge, Friedr.—Festschrift, Friedr. Kluge zum 70. Geburtstag am 21. Juni 1926 dargebracht von O. Behaghel, K. Bohnenberger, O. Dammann u. a. *Tübingen*: Engl. Seminar, 1926. v, 164 pp. M. 8.

Konrad von Würzburg.—Die Legenden. Hrg. v. Paul Gereke. 2. [Altd. Textbibl. Nr. 20. 2]. *Halle*: Niemeyer, 1926. xv, 63 pp. M. 1.80.

Kraus, Carl v.—Mhd. Übungsbuch. 2. verm. u. geänd. Aufl. [Germ. Bibl. Reihe 3, Bd. 2]. *Heidelberg*: Winter, 1926. xi, 297 pp. M. 6.50.

Lachmann, Fritz R.—Die "Studentes" des Christophorus Stymmelius und ihre Bühne. Als Anh. eine Uebers. d. Stückes u. 44 Bilder aus Joh. Rassers Christlich spiel von kinderzucht auf 15 Taf. [Theatergesch. Forsch. 34]. *Leipzig*: L. Voss, 1926. viii, 148 pp. M. 8.

Lessing.—Hamburgische Dramaturgie I. [Cambridge Plain Texts]. *Cambridge*:

Lewak, Adam.—Gottfried Keller und der polnische Freiheitskampf vom Jahre 1863/64. Akten u. Briefe, eingel. u. hrsg. Mit einem Vorw. von E. Ermatinger. *Zürich*: Orell Füssli, 1927. 156 pp. M. 4.80.

Liewehr, Ferd.—Die Ortsnamen des Kuhländchens. [Veröffentl. der Slavist. Arbeitsgemeinschaft a. d. Deutschen Univ. in Prag. Reihe 1, H. 1.] *Reichenberg*: Gebr. Stiepel, 1926. 89 pp. M. 3.20.

Lüdtke, W.—Die Offenbachsche Evangelien-Harmonie. [S.-A. aus Orientalia Hamburgensis, Festgabe]. *Hamburg*: Staats-u. Univ.-Bibliothek, 1926. Pp. 59-83, 4°.

Magon, Leopold.—Ein Jahrhundert geistiger u. literar. Beziehungen zwischen Deutschland u. Skandinavien 1750-1850. Bd. 1. Die Klopstockzeit in Dänemark. Johannes Ewald. *Dortmund*: F. W. Ruhfus, 1926. viii, 565 pp. Cloth, M. 20.

Maione, I.—La poesia di Lenau. *Messina-Roma*: G. Principato, 1926. 174 pp. L. 10.

Marx, Olga.—Carlyle's Translation of Wilhelm Meister. J. H. U. Diss. *Baltimore*: Johns Hopkins Press, 1925. 85 pp.

Meyer-Benfey, H.—Kleists Novellen "Michael Kohlhaas" und "Die heilige Cäcilie" im Wortlaut der ersten Fassung. Neudruck. [German. Bibl. 2. Abt., 23. Bd.]. *Heidelberg*: Winter, 1926. 30 pp. M. 1.

Minde-Pouet, Georg.—Kleists politisches Fragment "Zeitgenossen." Mit einer Faksimilenachbildung der Hs. [Schriften der Kleist-Gesellschaft, Bd. 6]. *Berlin*: Weidmann, 1926. 13 pp., 2 plates, 4°.

Mogk, Eugen.—Deutsche Heldensage. 2. verb. Aufl. [Deutschkundliche Bücherei]. *Leipzig*: Quelle & Meyer, 1926. 48 pp. 60 Pf.

Müller, H. v.—Das künstlerische Schaffen E. T. A. Hoffmanns in Umrissen angedeutet. *Leipzig*: Gesellsch. d. Freunde d. Deutschen Bücherei, 1926. 41 pp. M. 5.

Naumann, Hans.—Geschichte der deutschen Literatursprachen [Deutschkundl. Bücherei]. *Leipzig*: Quelle & Meyer, 1926. 34 pp. 60 Pf.

Schaefer, Gustav.—Die Mark und Berlin im Spiegel der Dichtung. *Berlin*: L. Oehmigke [1926]. 215 pp. Cloth, M. 4.

Schaeffler, Jul.—Das Mundartenbuch. *Berlin*: Dümmler, 1926. xii, 224 pp. M. 4.

Scheffel, J. V. v.—Briefe an Dr. A. Eismann im Brestenberg. Hrsg. v. R. Bosch. [Aus "Welt u. Leben."] *Aarau*: Sauerländer, 1926, 46 pp. M. 1.20.

—Jahrbuch des Deutschen Scheffelbundes. Hrsg. v. B. v. Münchenhausen. [Gabe des Scheffelbundes. 2.] *Karlsruhe*: A. Gräff, 1926. 85 pp. M. 5.

Schlegel.—Aug. Wilh. u. Friedrich Schlegel im Briefwechsel mit Schiller und Goethe. Hrsg. von Josef Körner u. Ernst Wieneke. *Leipzig*: Insel-Verl. [1926]. 287 pp. Cloth, M. 8.

Schwarz, Ernst.—Die germanischen Reibelauts s, f, ch im Deutschen. [Schriften d. Deutschen Wissenschaftl. Gesellsch. in Reichenberg, H. 1.] *Reichenberg*: Gebr. Stiepel, 1926. 78 pp. M. 2.70.

Selmer, Ernst W.—Über den Gebrauch des bestimmten Artikels im Nordfriesischen. [Skrifter utgitt av Det Norske Videnskaps-Akademi i Oslo. II. Hist-Filos. Kl. 1926, No. 2]. *Oslo*: Dybwad, 1926. 107 pp. 4°. Kr. 8.

Sommer, Paul.—Erläuterungen zu Gottfried Kellers "Die drei gerechten Kammacher." [Königs Erläuterungen zu d. Klassikern. Bdch. 181]. *Leipzig*: H. Beyer [1926]. 34 pp. 60 Pf.

—Erläuterungen zu Gottfried Kellers "Der grüne Heinrich." [Königs Erläuterungen, Bdchen. 182/183]. *Leipzig*: H. Beyer, 1926. 104 pp. M. 1.20.

Storm, Theod.—Immensee. Ed. with Introd., Notes, Exercises, and Vocab. by E. H. Zeydel. *New York*: A. A. Knopf, 1926. xvi, 122 pp.

Stuckert, Franz.—Das Drama Zacharias Werners. Entwicklung u. literargeschichtl. Stellung. [Deutsche Forschungen. H. 15]. *Frankfurt a. M.*: M. Diesterweg, 1926. xii, 193 pp. M. 6.

Van 't Hooft, B. H.—Das holländische Volksbuch vom Doktor Faust. Mit 20 Abb. *The Hague*: M. Nijhoff, 1926. vii, 163 pp. 4°. Fl. 6.

Wahl, Hans.—Die Bildnisse Carl Augusts von Weimar. Hrsg. [Schriften d. Goethe-Gesellschaft. Bd. 38]. *Weimar*: 1925. 63 pp., 1 plate, 48 pp. M. 5.

Weber, Paul C.—America in Imaginative German Literature in the first half of the Nineteenth Century [Columbia Univ. Germanic Series]. *New York*: Columbia Univ. Press, 1926. xiv, 301 pp. \$2.00.

Whitney, M. P., and Stroebe, L. L.—A Brief Course in German. Revised Ed. New York: Holt & Co. [1926]. xix, 199 pp.

Wolfram von Eschenbach, von Karl Lachmann. 6. Ausg. bearb. von Dr. Eduard Hartl. Berlin: de Gruyter, 1926. lxxii, 640 pp. Cloth, M. 20.

FRENCH

Aldington, R.—French studies and reviews. New York: Dial, 1926. 246 pp. \$2.50.

Arbalet, P.—Stendhal et le Petit Ange. Paris: Champion, 1926. 35 pp.

Banville, Th. de.—Le Quartier latin et la Bibl. Ste-Geneviève, éd. Boinet et Calot. Paris: Vanoest, 1926. 44 pp.

Barthou, L.—Rachel. Paris: Presses univ., 1926. 155 pp.

Baudelaire.—Dernières lettres inéd. à sa mère. Paris: Excelsior, 1926. 183 pp.

Baudri de Bourgueil.—Œuvres poétiques, éd. Phyllis Abrahams. Paris: Champion, 1926. lx + 407 pp.

Bonnard, A.—La Vie amoureuse d'Henri Beyle. Paris: Flammarion, 1926. 185 pp. Fr. 8.50.

Catalogue des livres impr. de la Bibl. Nat. T. 87. La Marck-La Nézière. Paris: Impr. nat., 1926. 1278 cols.

Champion, P.—Hist. de la Société polie; Ronsard et Villeroy; Secrétaires du roi et les poètes. Paris: Champion, 1925. 39 pp.

—Le Canonat pour Lemaire de Belges à Lyon. Lyons: Audin, 1926. 24 pp.

Chateaubriand.—Atala and René ed. C. Stewart. New York: Oxford, 1926. 186 pp. \$1.

Commynes.—Mémoires, éd. J. Calmette. T. 3. Paris: Champion, 1925. 446 pp. Fr. 22.

Conservateur littéraire, le.—Ed. crit. de J. Marsan. Paris: Hachette, 1926. 232 pp. (Soc. des textes fr. mod.)

Cool and Greenleaf.—El. Fr. comp. New York: Macmillan, 1926. \$1.40.

Duhamel, G.—Stories and sketches, ed. H. Harvitt. New York: Ginn, 1926. 212 pp. \$1.40.

Escholier, R.—V. Hugo artiste. Paris: Crès, 1926. 139 pp.

Flaubert.—Œuvres compl. Nouvelle éd. Augmentée (1830-46). Paris: Conard, 1926. xlv + 440 pp. Fr. 25.

France, A.—Œuvres complètes, éd. G. Le Prat. T. 3. Paris: Calmann-Lévy, 1926. 451 pp.

Gaulot, P.—Le Foyer de la Comédie Fr. (1870-1900). Paris: H. Parville, 1926. 238 pp.

Gillouin, R.—Esquisses litt. et morales. (Gide, Estaunié, Morand, Proust, etc.). Paris: Grasset, 1926. vi + 250 pp. Fr. 10.

Giraud, V.—Sœurs de grands hommes (Pascal, Chateaubriand, Renan). Paris: Crès, 1926. 217 pp. Fr. 10.

—Passions et romans d'autrefois. Paris: Champion, 1926. 251 pp.

Grant, C. F.—Hotchkiss Fr. gram. study. New York: Tuttle, 1926. 77 pp. 75 cts.

Gros, G.—L'Amour dans le roman de la rose. Paris: Bibl. du Lettré, 1926. 221 pp. Fr. 7.50.

Halévy, L.—L'abbé Constantin, ed. M. V. Smith. New York: Merrill, 1926. 328 pp. 75 cts.

Hervier, M.—Chefs d'œuvre poétique du XVI^e siècle. Paris: Delalain, 1926. 519 pp.

Hugo.—Notre Dame, ed. by J. H. Wilson. New York: Macmillan, 1926. ix + 187 pp. \$1.25

—Jean Valjean, extrait des Misérables, ed. de Sauzé. New York: Holt, 1926. x + 262 pp. 84 cts.

Jameson, R. P.—Rire et sourire (4 plays edited). New York: Century, 1926. xxvii + 200 pp. \$1.35.

Jasinski.—Contes de la vieille France. New York: Macmillan, 1926. viii + 198 pp. 60 cts.

Kramer, C.—Chénier et la Poésie parnassienne. Paris: Champion, 1926. 309 pp.

Labiche and Delacour.—La Cagnotte, ed. W. O. Farnsworth. New York: Heath, 1926. ix + 165 pp.

Lanson, G.—L'Ecole normale supérieure. Paris: Hachette, 1926. 55 pp.

Mansion, J. E.—Ex. in Fr. syntax. Boston: Heath, 1926. 152 pp. \$1.24.

McKenzie and Hamilton.—El. Fr. grammar. New York: Century, 1926. xi + 324 pp. \$1.50.

Montaigne.—Œuvres compl., éd. A. Armaingaud. T. IV. Paris: Conard, 1926. 557 pp. Fr. 25.

Mornet, D.—La Pensée fr. au XVIII^e s. Paris: A. Colin, 1926. 218 pp.

Nolhac, P. de.—Versailles et la cour de Fr. résidence de Louis XIV. Paris: Conard, 1925. xxxv + 313 and 371 pp. Fr. 50.

Philips, E.—Poésies fr. New York: Crofts, 1926. xxi + 206 pp. \$1.60.

Potter, H. A.—Dix contes modernes. Boston: Ginn, 1925. 136 pp. 52 cts.

Pradel, G.—Mme de Sévigné en Bourbonnais. Montluçon: Herbin et Bouché, 1926. 240 pp. Fr. 10.

Smallwood, M. C.—Petits contes faciles. Baltimore: Williams and Wilkins, 1925. 154 pp. \$1.25.

Sorel, Ch.—Histoire comique de Francion, éd. crit. d' E. Roy. II. Paris: Hachette, 1926. 243 pp. Fr. 25. (Soc. des textes fr. mod.)

Spink and Mills.—Colette et ses frères. New York: Ginn, 1926. vi + 182 pp. \$1.08.

Théâtre pour la jeunesse. New York: Brentano, 1924. \$1.25.

Truc, G.—Quelques peintres de l'homme contemp. (Giraudoux, du Gard. Fabre, Morand, Hamp etc.). Paris: éds. Spes, 1926. 183 pp. Fr. 8.

Veuillot, L.—Œuvres complètes. T. 8, 9. Paris: Lethielleux, 1926. viii + 560 + xvi + 556 pp.

Vignay.—Œuvres compl., éd. F. Baldensperger. Paris: Conard, 1925. 455 pp. Fr. 20.

Ward, C. F.—Minimum fr. vocab. test bk. New York: Macmillan, 1926. vii + 171 pp. 60 cts.

Williams, E. B.—Tech. and scientific Fr. New York: Heath, 1926. vii + 428 pp. \$1.88.

Windman, R.—Fundamentals of Fr. New York: Globe, 1926. 105 pp. 80 cts.

Zola.—L'attaque du Moulin, éd. H. B. Richardson. New York: Holt, 1925. 130 pp. 92 cts.

ITALIAN

Alfieri, Vittorio.—Oreste. Tragedia in cinque atti, con introduzione e note di A. Avancini. Milano: A. Vallardi, 1926. 123 pp. L. 2.75. (Collana di cultura classica.)

Alighieri, Dante.—"Dante ortofonico." La Divina Commedia corredata dei segni della pronunzia e di nuovi spedienti utili all'evidenza, ai raffronti, alle ricerche, alla memorazione, da L. Polacco. Sesta edizione interamente riveduta e rinnovata nel testo da G. Vandelli. Milano: U. Hoepli, 1926. xxxvi + 400 pp. L. 8.50. (Biblioteca classica Hoepliana.)

Bacci, O.—Il canto XXX dell' Inferno, letto nella sala di Dante in Orsanmichele. Firenze: G. C. Sansoni, 1925. 38 pp. L. 3.50. (Lectura Dantis.)

Berni, Francesco.—I capitoli. Introduzione e commenti di R. Dusi. Torino: Unione tip. edit. torinese, 1926. xxiv + 128 pp. L. 7. (Collezione di classici italiani con note, seconda serie, no. 12.)

Brofferio, A.—Canzoni piemontesi. Nuova edizione con prefazione. Torino: Fogola, G. B., 1926. xx + 208 pp. L. 10.

Carletti, Francesco.—Le più belle pagine, scelte da L. Barzini. Milano: Fratelli Treves, 1926. viii + 262 pp. (Le più belle pagine degli scrittori italiani scelte da scrittori viventi, no. 32.)

Cavalca, Domenico.—Le vite de' SS. Padri. Introduzione e note di Carmelina Naselli. Torino: Unione tip. edit. torinese, 1926. xxiv + 308 pp. L. 12. (Collezione di classici italiani con note, seconda serie, no. 23.)

Chiabrera, Gabriello.—Liriche. Introduzione e note di F. L. Mannucci. Torino: Unione tip. edit. torinese, 1926. xlv + 256 pp. L. 10. (Collezione di classici italiani con note, seconda serie, no. 26.)

Chini, M.—Vita e poesia di San Francesco. Narrazioni scelte dai "Fioretti," dalle "Considerazioni sopra le stimmate" e da altre opericciuole francescane, precedute da uno studio introduttivo e accompagnato da note; con xilografie di P. Parigi. Firenze: R. Bemporad e figlio, 1926. lii + 163 pp. L. 21.

Del Lungo, I.—Prolusione all' "Inferno," letta in Roma, in Siena, in Padova, in Livorno, in Torino. Firenze: G. C. Sansoni, 1925. 33 pp. L. 3.50. (Lectura Dantis.)

—Prolusione al Purgatorio letta in Orsanmichele e in Siena. Firenze: G. C. Sansoni, 1925. 35 pp. L. 3.50.

Della Giovanna, I.—Il canto II dell' Inferno, letto nella Sala di Dante in Orsanmichele. Firenze: G. C. Sansoni, 1925. 32 pp. L. 3.50. (Lectura Dantis.)

Fera, Jolanda.—I poemetti di Vincenzo Padula. Saggio critico. Cosenza: Tip. Agrillo e De Rose, 1926. xciv + 143 pp.

Ferri, A.—Creature manzoniane: Don Abbondio, Il padre Cristoforo, L'Innominato, Il Libro di Renzo; con nota di A. Boni. Ancona: Casa libr. Fogola, 1926. xv + 290 pp. L. 10.

Flamini, F.—Il canto XII del Purgatorio letto nella Sala di Dante in Orsanmichele. Firenze: G. C. Sansoni, 1925. 31 pp. L. 3.50. (Lectura Dantis.)

Flora, F.—D'Annunzio. Napoli: R. Ricciardi, 1926. 173 pp. L. 10.

Foscolo, Ugo.—Le ultime lettere di Jacopo Ortis a cura di G. Bertacchi. Firenze: G. Barbèra, 1926. xxxvii + 333 pp. L. 8.

—Poesie scelte, con note di E. Bellocchini. Torino: G. B. Paravia e C., 1926. iv + 144 pp. L. 11. (Biblioteca di classici italiani.)

—Saggi letterari. Introduzione e note di M. Fubini. Torino: Unione tip. edit. torinese, 1926. lxxii + 234 pp. L. 10.

(Collezione di classici italiani con note, seconda serie, no. 32.)

Gioberti, Vincenzo.—*L'Italia, la Chiesa e la Civiltà universale*. Pagine scelte a cura di A. Bruert. *Torino*: G. B. Paravia e C., 1926. xxix + 107 pp. L. 7. (Libretti di vita.)

—Prolegomeni del Primato morale e civile degli italiani scritti dall' autore. Introduzione e note di G. Balsamo-Crivelli. *Torino*: Unione tip. edit. torinese, 1926. 2 vols., xxxix + 231, 264 pp. L. 9 each. (Collezione di classici italiani con note, seconda serie, no. 33 e 34.)

Giovannozzi, G.—Il canto VII del Paradiso, letto nella Sala di Dante in Orsanmichele. *Firenze*: G. C. Sansoni, 1925. 43 pp. L. 3.50. (Lectura Dantis.)

Grimaldi, L.—Pensieri, versi e motti sul vino, raccolti da —. *Casale Monferrato*: Fratelli Marescalchi, 1926. 61 pp. L. 3. (Quaderni agrari.)

Guerri, D.—Il commento del Boccaccio a Dante; limiti della sua autenticità e questioni critiche che n'emergono. *Bari*: G. Laterza e figli, 1926. viii + 250 pp. L. 20. (Scrittori d'Italia.)

Guerrieri Crocetti, C.—La lirica pre-dantesca, a cura di —. *Firenze*: A. Vallecchi, 1925. 382 pp. L. 15. (Classici italiani commentati.)

Leopardi, Giacomo.—Poesie. *Firenze*: G. Barbèra, 1926. 64to., 354 pp. (Edizione Vade mecum.)

Mantovani, D.—Il canto XXXI del Purgatorio letto nella Sala di Dante in Orsanmichele. *Firenze*: G. C. Sansoni, 1925. 42 pp. L. 3.50. (Lectura Dantis.)

Manzoni, Alessandro.—I promessi sposi. Storia milanese del secolo XVII scoperta e rifatta. Con introduzione di U. Bucchioni. *Roma*: Albrighi, Segati e C., 1926. xx + 501 pp. L. 8.

Medin, A.—Il canto XIII dell' Inferno, letto nella Sala di Dante in Orsanmichele. *Firenze*: G. C. Sansoni, 1925. 56 pp. L. 3.50. (Lectura Dantis.)

Metastasio, Pietro.—Olimpiade; commentata da Maria Roselli, con un saggio introduttivo. *Catania*: C. Galàtola, 1926. 116 pp. L. 5. (Collezione del teatro italiano classico.)

Passerini, G. L.—Il canto XXIV dell' Inferno, letto nella Sala di Dante in Orsanmichele. *Firenze*: G. C. Sansoni, 1925. 33 pp. L. 3.50. (Lectura Dantis.)

Praga, E., Tarchetti, I. U., e Boito, A.—Le più belle pagine, scelte da M. Moretti. *Milano*: Fratelli Treves, 1926. ix + 302 pp. (Le più belle pagine degli scrittori italiani scelte da scrittori viventi, no. 31.)

Romani, F.—Il canto XIX del Purgatorio letto nella Sala di Dante in Orsanmichele. *Firenze*: G. C. Sansoni, 1925. 55 pp. L. 3.50. (Lectura Dantis.)

Salvadori, G.—Il canto I del Purgatorio letto nella Sala di Dante in Orsanmichele. *Firenze*: G. C. Sansoni, 1925. 38 pp. L. 3.50. (Lectura Dantis.)

Sapegno, N.—Frate Jacopone. *Torino*: Edizione del Baretti, 1926. 194 pp. L. 10.

Savi-Lopez, P.—Il canto XXX del Paradiso letto nella Sala di Dante in Orsanmichele. *Firenze*: G. C. Sansoni, 1925. 35 pp. L. 3.50. (Lectura Dantis.)

Tocco, F.—Il canto XXXII del Purgatorio letto nella Sala di Dante in Orsanmichele. *Firenze*: G. C. Sansoni, 1925. 52 pp. L. 3.50. (Lectura Dantis.)

Zardo, A.—Teatro veneziano del Settecento. *Bologna*: N. Zanichelli, 1925. 232 pp. L. 16.

SPANISH

"Azorín."—Los Quintero y otras páginas. *Madrid*: Caro Raggio, 1925. 264 pp. 5 ptas.

Baroja, P.—Zalacain el aventurero. Ed. with introduction, notes and vocabulary by S. L. M. Rosenberg and L. D. Bailiff. *New York*: Knopf, 1926. 256 pp.

Bécquer, G. A.—Rimas completas. Con un comentario lírico de M. de Unamuno. *Paris*: Excelsior, 1925. 192 pp.

Dernehl, C., Laudan, H., Marwedel, B. und Robledo, J. M.—Grundbuch. (Dernehl-Laudan, Spanisches Unterrichtswerk für höhere Schulen. Ausgabe B.). *Leipzig-Berlin*: B. G. Teubner, 1925. viii + 140 pp.

Dornhof, J.—Johann Nikolaus Böhl von Faber, ein Vorkämpfer der Romantik in Spanien. *Hamburg*: J. J. Augustin, 1925. viii + 46 pp.

El libro del idioma.—Lecturas literarias. Selección y anotación de L. Luzuriaga. *Madrid*: Imp. San Marcos, [1926]. 205 pp. 2,50 ptas. (Publicaciones de la "Revista de Pedagogía.")

Fentanes, B.—Espulgos del lenguaje. *Madrid*: Calpe, 1925. 219 pp. 4,50 ptas.

Flores, A.—Spanish Literature in English Translation. A Bibliographical Sylabus. *New York*: The H. W. Wilson Co., 1926. 82 pp.

González Palencia, A.—Historia de la España musulmana. *Barcelona-Buenos Aires*: Ed. Labor, 1925. 182 pp. 48 grabados y 12 láms. (Bibl. de Iniciación Cultural. Colección Labor. III.)

Groult, P.—Les mystiques des Pays-Bas et la Littérature espagnole du XVI^e siècle. Louvain: Lib. Uystpruyt, 1926. 320 pp. (Université de Louvain. Recueil de travaux publ. par les Conférences d'Histoire et de Philologie. 2^e série, 9^e fasc.)

Homenaje a Menéndez Pidal.—Miscelánea de estudios lingüísticos, literarios e históricos. Madrid: Hernando, 1926. 3 vols. 2065 pp. 160 ptas.

Lafuente, M.—Breve historia de España. Herausgegeben von A. Günther. Leipzig: Freytag, 1925. 179 pp.

Mayer, E.—Historia de la Instituciones sociales y políticas de España y Portugal durante los siglos V a XIV. Tomos I y II. Madrid: 1925 y 1926. 330 y 294 pp. 20 ptas. cada tomo.

Medina, J. T.—Diccionario de anónimos y seudónimos hispanoamericanos. Apuntaciones reunidas por . . . Tomos I y II. Buenos Aires: Imp. de la Universidad, 1925. xi + 250 y 342 pp. (Fac. de Fil. y Letras. Publicaciones. Núm. XXVI.)

Meléndez, C.—Amado Nervo. New York: Instituto de las Españas, 1926. 83 pp.

Menéndez y Pelayo, M.—Estudios sobre el teatro de Lope de Vega. Ed. ordenada y anotada por Bonilla y San Martín. Tomo V. Madrid: Velasco, 1925. 401 pp. 4 ptas. (Obras completas, XIV.)

Navarro, Tomás T.—Manual de pronunciación española. Tercera edición, corregida y aumentada. Madrid: Centro de Estudios Históricos, 1926. 320 pp. 8 ptas. (Publicaciones de la "Revista de Filología Española." III.)

Pérez Pastor, C.—Noticias y documentos relativos a la Historia y Literatura españolas. Tomo III. Madrid: Tip. de la "Revista de Archivos," 1926. 538 pp. 10 ptas. (Memorias de la Real Academia Española. Tomo XII.)

Quintana, M. J.—Vida del Cid. Herausgegeben von A. Günther. Frankfurt a. M.: Diesterweg, 1925. 33 pp.

Rodríguez Marín, F.—Más de 21,000 refranes castellanos no contenidas en la copiosa colección del Maestro Gonzalo Correas. Madrid: Tip. de la "Revista de Archivos," 1926. 1 + 519 pp. 20 ptas.

Romances del Cid.—Herausgegeben von A. Günther. Frankfurt a. M.: Diesterweg, 1926. 34 pp.

Théâtre espagnol.—Tome I: Encina, Torres Naharro, Lope de Rueda, Lope de Vega. Introduction et notes par H. Mérimée. Paris: "La Renaissance du Livre," [1925?]. 227 pp. (Les Cent chefs-d'œuvre étrangers.)

PORTUGUESE

Cantigas d'amigo dos trovadores galego-portugueses. Edição crítica acompanhada de introdução, comentário, variantes e glossário por J. Joaquín Nunes. Vol. II: Texto. Coimbra: Imp. da Universidade, 1926. xvi + 468 pp. (Biblioteca de Escritores Portugueses. Serie A.)

Carvalho, R.—Toda a America. Poema. Rio de Janeiro: Pimenta de Mello e Companhia, 1926. 146 pp.

Hills, E. C., Ford, J. D. M., and Coutinho, J. de Siqueira.—A Portuguese Grammar. Boston: Heath, 1925. x + 393 pp.

Latino Coelho, J. M.—Paginas escolhidas. Compilação e prefácio de Arlindo Valera. Vol. I. Lisboa: Empresa Literária Fluminense Lda, [1926]. 325 pp.

Montemor, J. de.—A Diana. Em português de Affonso Lopes Vieira. Lisboa: Garret, 1924. lxxx + 246 pp.

Peregrino da Silva, M. C.—A Bibliotheca Nacional em 1919. Rio de Janeiro: Officinas Graphicas da Bibliotheca Nacional, 1925.

CATALAN

Llull, R.—Poesies. Text, notes i glossari de R. d'Alòs-Moner. Barcelona: Els Nostres clàssics, 1925. 192 pp.

Pol, A.—Folk-lore musical mallorquí. Tomo I. Barcelona: A. Boileau, 20 pp. 6 ptas. (Editorial Ibérica Musical.)

Pons, J. S.—Chante-Perdrix. Canta-Perdiu. Eglogues Catalanes avec la traduction française en regard. Paris: Champion, 1925. 195 pp.

Pujol, F. i J. Puntí.—Observacions, apèndixs i notes al "Romancerillo Catalán" de Manuel Milá y Fontanals. Estudi d'un exemplar amb notes inédites del mateix autor. Barcelona: Imp. Elzeviriana i Llibreria Camí, 1926. 91 pp. (Obra del Cançoner popular de Catalunya. Materials. Volum I. Fascicle I.)

Rokseth, Pierre.—Terminologie de la Culture des Cereales a Majorque. [Biblioteca Filologica de l'Institut de la llengua catalana, vol. XV.] Barcelona: 1923. 216 pp.

Wagner, Max Léopold.—Notes linguistiques sur l'argot barcelonais. [Biblioteca Filologica de l'Institut de la llengua catalana, vol. XVI.] Barcelona: 1924. 106 pp.

PROVENÇAL

Haskell, D. C.—Provençale Lit. and Lang. A list of references. New York: Public Library, 1922. 885 pp.

Durand-Malphettes.—Raymond de Miraval. Albi: Impr. du Sud-Ouest, 1926. 58 pp.